INDIA.

EDITED BY GORDON HEWART, B.A.

FORMERLY SCHOLAR OF UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, OXFORD.

ENTERED AT STATIONERS' HALL.] [OFFICES: 84, PALACE CHAMBERS, LONDON, S.W.

VOL. IV., No. 10. (NEW SERIES.) OCTOBER 1, 1893. SUBSCRIPTION, POST PAID, Six Shillings per ann.

CONTENTS:

	PAGE.
INDIANA: Paragraphs on Indian Topics, by "Fidus" ..	289
The New Viceroy	294
The Hindu-Mussulman Riots	296
The Opium Commission	298
,, ,, Summary of Evidence	299
Resignation of Mr. H. Morse Stephens	304
HEALTH LECTURES FOR INDIAN VILLAGES, by Miss Florence Nightingale	305
THE LATE HON. JUSTICE K. T. TELANG, by John Adam, M.A.	306
INDIAN HOARDS OF SILVER, by D. E. Wacha	309
THE SEPARATION OF JUDICIAL AND EXECUTIVE FUNCTIONS, by Romesh Chunder Dutt	311
SIR E. ARNOLD AT POONA	312
The Opium Commission: Summary of Evidence (continued)	313
REVIEWS: The Early Days of the East India Company ..	315
Comtemporary Indian History	317
Campbell's Memoirs. (Second Notice.) ..	319
BIBLIOGRAPHY of Books and Articles on Indian Subjects	320

Indiana.

In another column will be found an article by Miss Florence Nightingale on Village Sanitation in India.

Sir Wilfrid Lawson's verses to Mr. Caine were, I am sorry to say, premature. The bridle of Theages has prevented Mr. Caine from entering upon a task to which he would have brought unrivalled knowledge. He was forbidden by his doctors to take any part in the investigations of the Opium Commission, and his ill-health will be deeply regretted by his numerous friends in India. They will in common with Mr. Caine's friends in England wish him a speedy recovery. Meantime his place on the Opium Commission has been filled by Mr. H. J. Wilson, M.P., who sits in Parliament for the Holmfirth Division of Yorkshire. Mr. Wilson's ability to estimate evidence, and his special qualifications for the work of Lord Brassey's Commission are well-known. It would have been difficult to find a better substitute for Mr. Caine.

A summary of the evidence given before the Opium Commission, at its sittings in London, will be found elsewhere in this issue. It is worth remarking that the injustice of compelling India to pay half the cost of an inquiry instituted in deference to no request of hers has been urged with practical unanimity in the British press.

It is impossible not to regret that the Indian Budget did not come on at an earlier period in the Session, or was not further postponed until the autumn sittings. The policy of obstruction has reaped a rich harvest during the present Session of Parliament, and India, like Wales and rural England, suffers in consequence. Before the Session opened the Unionist party roundly declared that the Government intended to occupy the whole time of Parliament with the Home Rule Bill. Well, one mode of acquiring a reputation as a prophet is to fulfil one's own predictions, and it has been through no fault of the Unionists that Home Rule has not taken up the whole time of a busy and protracted Session. Mr. Gladstone, replying last June to a memorial signed by a large number of members interested in Indian affairs, admitted "the special interest now attaching to the question of Indian finance," and agreed that "even if it be to impose a further sacrifice, adequate time ought to be found for" discussion of it. When it became clear that if the Indian Budget were taken at all before the adjournment, it would have to be taken in the last week, and in a small and wearied House, a request was made that it might be postponed until the autumn sittings. Unfortunately, however, that request was not granted, and on September 20th the House reached "Committee upon the East India Revenue Accounts."

Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji had given notice that upon the motion to go into Committee on the Indian Budget he would move

"That, having regard to the grave financial position of the Government of India, and the deplorable condition of the people, arising out of the defects in the system of administration and the oppressive taxation caused by excessive Military and Civil Expenditure, this House is of opinion that a Royal Commission should be appointed to make full enquiry into the

Civil and Military Administration of India, and as to the financial relations which should justly exist between India and this country; such Commission to include a fair proportion of representative Indians and to take evidence in India and in England."

This motion was subsequently exchanged for the following:

"That, in the opinion of this House, a Royal Commission should be appointed to inquire into the economic condition of the people of India, and their ability to sustain the present cost of the Indian Government, and also to consider what financial relations should exist between India and this country."

The Indian Parliamentary Committee issued an urgent Whip, requesting members to be in their places for the discussion and to take part in the division. The Whip was signed by Mr. Jacob Bright, Mr. W. S. Caine, Mr. J. E. Ellis, Mr. W. A. Hunter, Mr. A. Illingworth, Sir W. Lawson, Mr. W. S. B. McLaren, Mr. J. G. Swift MacNeill, Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, Mr. H. W. Paul, Sir Joseph Pease, Mr. T. H. Roberts, Mr. R. T. Reid, Mr. Samuel Smith, Mr. C. E. Schwann, Mr. Eugene Wason, Mr. A. Webb, and Sir W. Wedderburn.

Listening to the speeches from the gallery of the House, one could not fail to be struck by their earnestness, eloquence, and moderation. Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji and Sir W. Wedderburn made a marked impression. But unfortunately the Commission was not granted. Mr. George Russell explained that Commissions are of use only where there is ignorance to be removed, and are often employed for dilatory purposes. Are we, I wonder, to infer from this that the civil and military extravagance in India is committed deliberately, and that the Government will suggest some more expeditious mode of inquiry into India's needs than a Royal Commission would supply? Sir William Harcourt's contention was twofold—that the task of the proposed Commission would be enormous, and that while it was sitting the foundations of the Government in India would be shattered. Put rather differently, the argument is that if a duty seems formidable it ought to be shirked, and, where there is nothing to reveal, revelation is ruinous! It was reasonable to expect something better than this from a Liberal Government. But it is worth remembering that, not fewer than three times, Mr. George Russell protested that the Government would loyally carry out the resolution of the House of Commons in regard to Simultaneous Examinations.

Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji has added to his great Parliamentary victory in the matter of simultaneous examinations a further success in regard to the Madras and Bombay Armies Bill. The Government had accepted the amendment of the House of Lords allowing the Commanders-in-Chief to be appointed to the Executive Councils. Mr. Naoroji, however, objected to this course, and proposed in effect that the Bill should be restored to its original form. A division on a motion for adjournment showed the strength of the Indian Parliamentary party, and, on the following day, September 12th, Mr. G. Russell announced the acceptance of Mr. Naoroji's amendments. Mr. Russell's words are significant. "Having regard," he said, "to the fact that there is in this House of Commons a strong feeling that the Commanders-in-Chief should not retain their seats, we have no doubt—*especially after the speeches made last night*—as to the desirability of the course we are now pursuing." Mr. Naoroji is to be congratulated. Sir R. Temple was a sight for gods and men when Mr. Russell made his declaration. Words failed to express Sir Richard's indignation and confusion, and he said as much.

By the death of the Hon. Justice K. T. Telang, C.I.E., India and the cause of her advancement, intellectual, social, political, have suffered a severe loss. Though his elevation to the Bench of the High Court four years ago prevented him, subsequently, from taking an active part in political affairs, it was well known that he had not changed his views, and his advice was as freely sought and as wisely given. There will be found on another page a sketch of his life, and an "appreciation" of his character, by Mr. John Adam, M.A., Principal of Pachanjappás College, Madras, who had known him for some years, and been associated with him in political and latterly in literary work. I trust that the volume on Maráthá history to which Mr. Adam refers will have received all the benefit that Mr. Telang's final revision could give it. I have no doubt Bombay will not be backward in commemorating this foremost of her sons, and trust she will give his friends throughout India and in England an opportunity of joining in any movement for that purpose.

Since Mr. Adam's article was in type, I have received a letter from a leading Parsee gentleman, of Bombay, written on 1st September, the day of Mr. Telang's death. It expresses so well the feeling of all sections of the Indian community that I quote it here: "In him not only the community of Bombay but the people of India have lost one of their few brilliant leaders. Mr. Telang was a noble specimen of the Hindus, and also a bright product of our early University. It is mournful to think that he should have been thus prematurely cut off in the prime of manhood. There are not, I think, half a dozen men in all India to compare with him. He was not only a learned judge and a sound scholar,

he was a sober politician and an infallible guide and adviser. His death is, indeed, very, very sad. All India from one corner to the other must bemoan his loss. It is a public calamity, for it will be difficult to replace his loss for many years to come."

I have received a piece of exceedingly good news from Nagpur. The claim of the people of the Central Provinces to elect a representative for nomination to a seat on the Supreme Legislative Council has not only been urged in the House of Commons by members of the Indian Parliamentary Committee, but has also been submitted to the Secretary of State for India through the Local Administration and the Government of India. I remarked recently the extremely unsatisfactory character of Mr. George Russell's replies to questions asked in the House of Commons. It is, therefore, the more pleasant to hear that the request has, after all, been granted. "It appears," writes a correspondent in Nagpur, "that the Local Government will most probably follow the example set by other Provinces. The Municipal Committees, the District Councils, and the Local Boards are likely to obtain the franchise. They will select their representatives, and these representatives will elect a gentleman whose name will be submitted to the Viceroy and Governor-General in Council for nomination as a member of the Supreme Legislative Council. This procedure will certainly be open," my correspondent continues, "to a good many objections. The Viceroy and Governor-General in Council may reject the recommendation, and so forth. But, unless a change is made by other Provinces, there is very little chance that this Administration will be liberal enough to recommend better rules of procedure for adoption by the Supreme Government. This is, therefore, a task to which all of us will have to set ourselves." That is a good fighting temper. But the Central Provinces are manifestly grateful for what they have obtained, and mention as a special coadjutor Sir A. P. Macdonnell.

Sir A. P. Macdonnell has always been in sympathy with the popular cause. Just before the seventh Congress was held at Nagpur, in the Central Provinces (of which he was at the time Chief Commissioner), he held a Durbar there. After the formal business of the Durbar was concluded, and the assembly had broken up, he stood at the door of the Durbar tent talking in a friendly manner with Mr. Narayen Swami and other leading citizens. Somehow the question of the Congress arose and Mr. Macdonnell (as he then was) took the opportunity of saying, in effect: "I hear that some of you are anxious to know whether I shall object to your attending the Congress. I can assure you that I shall not think any the better or any the worse of any man, because he does, or does not, attend the Congress. That is purely a matter for his own consideration, and does not in any degree affect me as a Government official. I am entirely neutral in the matter as a Government official, and if you ask me in that capacity whether you should or should not attend, I must decline to give any reply. But if you ask me as a private friend, then I should say that if you see your way to benefit your country and your fellows by these Congresses, then most certainly do your duty as good citizens and attend." It is to be regretted that no other Provincial Governor has ever taken up so thoroughly rational and sound a position.

Apropos of Mr. Dutt's further remarks, which will be found in another column, upon the much-needed separation of judicial and executive functions, it is worth noting that last July a question which the Hon. Surendranath Banerjea proposed to ask on this subject in the reformed Bengal Council was disallowed. The question ran as follows:—

"To ask whether the attention of Government has been called to the discussion in the newspapers regarding the separation of judicial and executive functions, which are now combined in one and the same officer, in the matter of the administration of criminal justice; and whether, having regard to the opinion of the Calcutta High Court that the existing system is 'exceedingly dangerous,' and the observation of Lord Dufferin, that the separation of executive and judicial functions is a counsel of perfection, the Government was prepared to take any action? If so, whether preparatory to such action the Government would appoint a Commission to inquire into the question with a view to suggest a practicable scheme?"

The ostensible pretext on which this question was disallowed was that it referred to a matter beyond the control of the Lieutenant-Governor. But surely it is competent to the Government of Bengal to urge upon the Government of India the necessity of the reform. Even if this be not the case, it does not follow that the question should have been disallowed altogether.

I find, however, that a second question proposed by the Hon. Surendranath Banerjea was also disallowed. It related to a recommendation of the Public Service Commission, in connection with the appointment of natives of India to the higher grades of the Police Service. The recommendation has, of course, remained almost a dead letter. The question asked

"Whether, having regard to the observation made by the Public Service Commission in their report, 'that endeavours should be made to introduce a reasonable proportion of native officers into the higher grades of the Police Department, due regard being always had to the efficiency of the Service,' and to the distinct recommendation of the Commission that admission to the grade of Assistant-Superintendent should be, among other ways, 'by promotion from the grade of Inspectors for

exceptional merit and ability shown in active service,' the Government is of opinion that the present number of Indian officials holding appointments in the higher grades of the Police Service, viz., 2 District Superintendents in the two lowest grades out of a total of 55, 1 Assistant Superintendent out of a total of 29, and one probationer out of 8, or 4 Indian officers in all out of a total of 92, does adequate justice to the claims of natives of India for employment in the higher branches of the Police Service?"

This question was disallowed on the ground that it was argumentative, and was the subject of correspondence between the Government of Bengal and the Government of India. Now, one cannot help thinking that these things point to some arbitrariness on the part of the officials in the use of the discretion which is permitted to them.

Sir Mortimer Durand's mission to the Ameer has been enveloped, so far as the English press is concerned, in an impenetrable veil of mystery. Either our pastors and masters have not known the facts, or they have not been anxious to disclose them. To turn inside out, and upside down, leading articles in the *Times* and the *Standard* is, after all, a somewhat circuitous method of arriving at information. The public, whether in India or in England, have a right to know what instructions have been given to Sir Mortimer Durand, what the object of his mission is, and what the extent of his authority. Enough is known of the broad facts to create the most uneasy suspicions as to this mysterious errand. Foreign Secretary to the Government of India, Sir Mortimer Durand is well known to be committed to the extreme "forward" policy on the frontier. Moreover, the fact that he is a permanent official invests him with an importance which makes him the less suitable for ill-defined negotiations. Viceroys, a permanent secretary may say, come and go, but I go on for ever.

It looks as if the Government of India and the Home Government were faced with two risks, one or other of which may mean very serious trouble. When the *Times* tells us in one and the same article, that the Ameer's people are not to be trusted, and that Sir Mortimer Durand will intrust himself "without reserve to the good faith of the Ameer's troops," the safety of the Mission can hardly be said to be beyond doubt. And if that Scylla be avoided there is yet the Charybdis of our being committed to such a frontier policy as would be immediately condemned if it were made known. These inscrutable missions are not to be encouraged, and it is to be hoped that some enquiring mind will seek information on the subject in the House of Commons. Any such question would, it is to be feared, be disallowed in the Councils.

I hope to deal more fully on a future occasion with the important question of Indian frontier policy. The subject has of late been a fruitful source of controversy in the *Times* and some other London newspapers, and Lord Chelmsford has come with distinction out of his passage-at-arms with Mr. G. N. Curzon. Sir J. Adye, also, has contributed more than one valuable paper to the discussion. The task of these gentlemen would be less difficult if some of those who advocate a "forward" policy would condescend to formulate a definite scheme. This, however, they shrink from doing, preferring (for obvious reasons) to shelter themselves under vague generalities, or to take refuge in criticisms founded on serious misrepresentations of the aim and purpose of their opponents' proposals.

The Bombay riots are discussed in another column. But while officials in India are busily employed to find a scapegoat to bear the blame of their own lack of touch with the people, and some ill-informed critics in England are censuring the work of the Indian National Congress, it may be worth while to call attention to the circular issued by Mr. A. O. Hume to the Congress Committees, in 1888, shortly after the meeting of the Congress at Madras. The circular was reprinted in recent issues of the *Hindu*, and other native papers. "In the course of his conversations with numerous Muhammadan gentlemen, our late honoured President" (Mr. Badrudin Tyabji, a well-known Muhammadan), wrote Mr. Hume, "discovered that in the minds of most of those who had been holding aloof from the Congress movement, an apprehension lurked that the Hindus, being numerically strongest, might at some time press and carry in Congress some resolution directly hostile to Muhammadan interests. It is needless to say that he is just as certain as I am myself that the Hindus, to say nothing of the growing Eurasian and European element, would never do anything of the kind, and that they feel that the Muhammadans, are in good sooth, their fellow-countrymen, whose welfare, happiness, and content, are their welfare, happiness, and content."

The circular proceeded to refer specifically to the question of cow-killing, and after stating that the members of the Congress hoped to see in the following year "a complete reconciliation with all those sections of our Muhammadan brethren which have hitherto held aloof from us," Mr. Hume added a draft rule which he had formulated. The rule is so important that I must quote it in full. "No subject shall be passed for discussion by the Subject Committee, or allowed to be discussed at any Congress by the President thereof, to the introduction of which the Hindu or Muhammadan delegates, as a body, object, unanimously or nearly unanimously,

and if after the discussion of *any* subject, which *has* been admitted for discussion, it shall appear that the Hindu or Muhammadan delegates, as a body, are unanimously or nearly unanimously opposed to the resolution which it is proposed to pass thereon, such resolution shall be dropped without reference to whether the opposers constitute the majority or the minority."

Taken in connection with the evidence adduced by Sir W. Wedderburn in his recent article in the *New Review*, these efforts of the Congress so long ago as 1888 show—what needed no proof beyond notorious facts—that the aim of the Congress is to unite the population of India in friendship and mutual goodwill. Now, if the Congress foresaw in 1888 the need of such efforts how comes it that even in 1893 the officials are protesting that they on their part have done all they could to prevent such collisions as the riots in Bombay, and that the riots came as a surprise to them? What has prevented the officials from achieving something like success —blindness or caprice? At any rate, it is clear that if the same discernment and good will which are evident in the work of the Congress had somehow penetrated to the work of the officials the differences between Hindus and Mussulmans might have been rendered less harmful. Sooner or later Government will perhaps perceive the expediency of associating, in their task of administration, men who understand and are disposed to deal rationally with the diverse sentiments and beliefs of the vast Indian community.

No one will grudge the Rev. Dr. Miller the honour of election to the Legislative Council of Madras, but the fact of that election need not be distorted in the extraordinary fashion which the *Times* has seen fit to adopt. It says, "His election to the Legislative Council by the Madras University, *a body almost entirely composed of Hindus and Muhammadans*, is a striking testimony to the esteem and confidence which a great Christian teacher may win from the educated classes in India." The writer is surely under the impression that the electors were, as here, the graduates. They are, however, the members of a purely nominated body, the Senate. I find from the last *University Calendar* that the Senate consisted of 129 members, of whom only 33 were Hindus and Muhammadans, leaving 96 Europeans and Eurasians. Moreover, of the 129, no fewer than 86 are Government officials, past and present. And this farce is popular representation! The fact is that, in spite of the character of the electing body, at the meeting at which the election took place, the votes were equal—18 for Dr. Miller, and 18 for Rai Bahadur P. Ranganadam Mudaliyar, M.A., and the European was elected only by the casting vote of the Vice-Chancellor, Chief Justice Sir Arthur Collins.

The August number of India contained an article headed "A Sad Story and its Sequel." I am glad to say that the persecuted men were all acquitted by the Court of Session. But the case proves the need of amendment in the law.

A grim comment upon British rule in India is furnished by the report of the committee appointed to inquire into "the rules, regulations, and practice in the Indian cantonments and elsewhere with regard to prostitution." The bulky Blue Book, containing more than 500 pages, is by this time in the hands of those whose melancholy duty it will be to peruse its contents. I can only give here the conclusions at which the committee arrived as to matters of fact:—

(1) That in all the ten cantonments mentioned in the evidence a system of periodical examination of the lock hospitals of women consorted with principally (if not exclusively) by British soldiers, under conditions in effect compulsory, was maintained during various periods, extending altogether from 1888 to 1893.

(2) That those women, in common with other known prostitutes, were permitted to live in certain assigned quarters in the cantonments, but that, distinctly from other prostitutes, the name and residences of the women attending the periodical examinations were entered in special registers or lists kept at the lock hospitals, and in some cases also in other books in the possession of the Mahaldarnis superintending the women, and in which register or books respectively was recorded the "state" (in a specific sense) of those women individually on each examination.

(3) That all the women found on examination to be free from disease, and who formed the large majority of the women so examined, were set free to resume their occupation.

(4) That the special hospitals provided in each cantonment for contagious diseases (now constituting sections of cantonment general hospitals, but formerly, and still called, lock hospitals) were used almost exclusively for the purpose of the periodical examination and of the treatment of the women then found diseased.

(5) That the numerous official orders and regulations, speaking generally, failed to effect the intended abolition of the old system of regulated and licensed prohibition.

(6) That the rules of 1890 (under the Cantonment Act, 1889) were worked in connection with the continuous system of periodical examination

and the practices incidental thereto carried on since 1888.

(7) That this system and the incidental practices above described did not, and the statutory rules, so far as they authorise or permit the same, do not accord with the accepted meaning and intention of the resolution of the House of Commons.

Sir D. M. Stewart and Sir J. B. Peile drew up a separate report, but they practically admitted the same facts.

Now the report of this committee suggests very many considerations into which I need not enter. But one of the most important questions which it raises is how far officials in India are (1) concerned to carry out the will of the House of Commons, and (2) aware of the state of affairs which they are supposed to control. The resolution which the House of Commons adopted in 1888 in regard to this hateful business made the duty of the Commander-in-Chief perfectly plain, and the Commander-in-Chief asserted that his duty was being discharged. The investigations of Mrs. Andrew and Dr. Kate Bushnell, two American ladies, showed that something quite different was going on. When Lord Roberts returned to England, he repeated to an interviewer his assertion that the forbidden system was discontinued. Yet Lord Roberts had won for himself a unique reputation as a Commander who inquired into the most minute details relating to the surroundings of the military under his care.

If these things be done in the green tree, what will be done in the dry? If Lord Roberts was so wofully ignorant as to the existence of practices which were flourishing almost under his eyes, to what extremes must blundering and mismanagement run among responsible officials in India? Lord Roberts, that we may do him justice, offered, when he became acquainted with the facts, frank and full apology to the ladies whose statements he had contradicted. He has been hoodwinked by the authorities, and he was very sorry to have impugned the truth of evidence which he was not in a position to weigh. Lord Roberts deserves credit for so straightforward a confession. But the very straightforwardness of it only makes the more remarkable his statement, contained in the letter of apology, that "it would have been better if the "missionary ladies had been commended to the care "of the authorities in India." Ingenuous simplicity can no further go. "It would have been better" —for the ladies to be hoodwinked as well. Really, this is too funny! Yet, amusing as it is, we must remember that after all it represents faithfully enough the general attitude of Indian officials to the British public. If the British public were content to follow the advice of these worthies they would in all cases close their eyes and ears to information which did not reach them from an official source.

A correspondent writes:—The last report of the Telegraph Department in India shows that an ample "dividend" has been "earned" on the gross capital expenditure. It is questionable, however, whether in the interests of the public a Government department should be allowed to show a profit on its transactions. At first sight it would seem that the public are being overcharged for their messages. In the present case there is a still more serious objection to the way in which the revenue of the department is inflated. Some of the State and guaranteed railways are being charged far too much for the use of the telegraph wires and instruments supplied to them by Government. The result is to reduce their profits and thus indirectly to help to discourage fresh investment of private capital in new undertakings. There ought to be strict inquiry into the matter by the Secretary of State. An honest revision of rentals will result in a large sum being set free to increase dividends, and it is in the interests of stockholders that it should be carried out at an early date.

The contract for the telegraph cable from Zanzibar to Seychelles and Mauritius has (my correspondent continues) been given by the British Government to the Eastern Telegraph Company, or rather this Company is to work the cable and to receive a subsidy for it. So that a further step has deliberately been taken to strengthen the existing monopoly of telegraphic communication by sea in the Eastern hemisphere. It is known that the cable could have been laid—that an offer was made to lay it—at a cheaper rate than that now agreed to be paid. But the Eastern Company and a certain manufacturing company work together. The former possesses, too, a concession for a term of years for landing cables at Zanzibar. FIDUS.

THE NEW VICEROY.

"THE Military Secretary to the Government was "Colonel (now Sir Henry) Norman, a very able and "distinguished officer who had served as Adjutant-"General during the siege of Delhi and the Oudh "campaign. He enjoyed the entire confidence of "Colin Campbell (Lord Clyde) and now had great "weight with John Lawrence in all military affairs. "Indeed, there was none whose advice was more "followed than his." So, in "Men and Events of my Time in India," writes Sir Richard Temple of the eminent soldier, not less eminent in civil administration, who has lately been chosen to be Lord Lansdowne's successor. It is, as we have been

forestalled in saying, the unexpected which happens. Among the many names selected by that interesting class of persons whose business it is to assist the Government in announcing important appointments, Sir Henry Norman's had not found a place. He is none the worse for that, nor for the faint praise with which his appointment has been received in some circles of disconcerted prophecy. That genial mood of criticism which is "willing to wound and yet afraid to strike" has not been far to seek during the last few weeks, but few men have less to fear from it than the Governor of Queensland. His career as a soldier and as a military administrator has been brilliant, and India is the field in which the greater part of it has been passed. So long ago as 1844 he was an ensign in the Bengal army. Four years later he served in the Punjab campaign. There followed nearly a decade of active service in the field—on the Punjab frontier, in the Sonthal campaign, and in the Mutiny. At Lucknow, Delhi, and Cawnpore he distinguished himself as a gallant officer, and his name is mentioned with striking frequency in the despatches. The Mutiny over, he followed up his service in the field with a period of admirable work in the military administration. In 1860 he was appointed Assistant Military Secretary at the Horse Guards. Two years later he became Secretary to the Government of India in the Military Department, and for seven years, from 1870 onwards, he was Military Member of the Viceroy's Council. Returning to England, he served from 1878 to 1883 at the India Office as Military Member in the Council of the Secretary of State. In the latter year he bade farewell to military affairs as his chief employment and has since won for himself, as Governor of Jamaica and of Queensland, a high reputation as a civil administrator in circumstances of special delicacy and difficulty.

Such has been, hitherto, the career of the man who, at the beginning of next year, will return to India to undertake the arduous duties of the Viceroyalty. He will undertake them, we need hardly say, amid the utmost goodwill on the part of the Indian and the British public. A new appointment is, of course, a universal stimulus to premature opinions, and it is not to be expected that, when everybody is talking, nobody will talk unwisely or uncharitably. There are, it has been well said, some men with just imagination enough to spoil their judgment. Those native papers which, leaping at hasty conclusions, have permitted themselves to prejudge the new Viceroy, have done justice neither to themselves nor to him. Frankly, for our part, we are disposed to regard Sir Henry Norman's appointment with no little satisfaction. Let those who are inclined to cavil remember what happened when Lord Ripon went out to India as Viceroy. Never did high statesmanlike qualities dissipate prejudice more completely or in a shorter time than in the case of that great ruler. "A Whig marquis and a job," said many of the wise heads in India, when the appointment was announced. But Lord Ripon had not been three days in the country when he was hailed with public enthusiasm. So great were the esteem and the affection which he at once compelled, that when, shortly after his arrival, he was attacked with fever, the native temples were thronged with men eager to pray for his recovery. Now, Lord Ripon, in that memorable speech of his at Poona, had asked that he might be judged by his deeds. Sir Henry Norman deserves no less, and we ask for him no more. What, we may well inquire, would the hasty critics have? True, Sir Henry Norman is not a peer, but we should be sorry to think that anybody except the *Times of India* is inconsolable on that account. That journal, with characteristic modesty, "altogether disapproves" of the appointment, and describes it as "a sudden and serious departure from the rule consecrated by experience, that, in sending to India a Viceroy, England should give a man of the best birth, *status*, and capacity." The snobbery which is here implied is not likely to taint native opinion to any serious extent. The exploded superstition that a Viceroy of India must be a peer would, if it were not exploded, have a gravely prejudicial effect in limiting the field of choice. The number of dukes, marquises, and earls, in this best of all possible worlds, is restricted, and Mr. Gladstone's courage in looking beyond "the classes" for Lord Lansdowne's successor deserves recognition on the part of the native population to whose welfare he will have so much to say. And Mr. Gladstone has found in this wider field a Viceroy of singularly wide experience. Already thoroughly well acquainted with Indian affairs, and able, therefore, to take up the threads of the administration at once, Sir Henry Norman will bring to his task large civil experience, gathered from a career of colonial government in which he has achieved unbroken success. Recent events have shown in a strong—perhaps an exaggerated—light the difficulties which confront the Indian official in respect of antipathies of race and creed. It happens that in Jamaica Sir Henry Norman had to deal with racial questions of acute difficulty. He dealt with them with pre-eminent success, holding the balance equally, and winning confidence and respect, not merely from a section of the population, but from the population as a whole. The baneful, the criminal policy of "Divide and Rule" will meet with no sympathy at the hands of such an one. Whatever be the facts—and in such cases the facts are terribly difficult to ascertain—it cannot be denied that there is, unfortunately enough, a belief abroad in India that racial and religious differences have sometimes been exploited in the interests of bureaucratic rule. The mere existence of such a belief, however groundless, is nothing short of a calamity. It should certainly receive a check from the presence of a statesman of Sir H. Norman's special experience at the head of affairs. Moreover, the lessons which he learned in Jamaica have been supplemented in Queensland in a way which will be fraught with advantage in his new sphere. Dealing in Queensland with circumstances that were quite different from those which he had previously known, Sir Henry Norman has played a conspicuously successful part in the work of a constitutional government. This versatility, not less than the special nature of the experiences in which it has been displayed, augurs well for the new Viceroy's work in India.

But this is not all. Sir Henry Norman is known

chiefly as a soldier. "It is not good," the *Times* thinks, "that the supreme head of the Civil Administration of India should be a soldier. We rule that "country by the sword, and it is the merest cant for "us to pretend to forget that fundamental fact our- "selves, or to hope that the races of India will forget "it; but it is at the same time in the highest degree "undesirable to obtrude the truth needlessly upon "their notice, as the nomination of a soldier to the "Viceroyalty must do. It was thought that the "Government were alive to this consideration, and "that in their perception of it lay the exclusion of a "much more famous soldier than Sir Henry Norman "from this coveted position." Does not the *Times* perceive that there is all the difference in the world between appointing a soldier like Sir Henry Norman and appointing a soldier like Lord Roberts to be Viceroy of India? An observer who speaks with the highest possible authority, says on this crucial matter: "Frontier questions are very critical just now, and on them Sir H. Norman is thoroughly sound. He is, perhaps, the strongest living opponent of Indian 'Jingoism,' and at this moment that is a very valuable qualification for a Viceroy." We are not at liberty to divulge the author of this judgment. We will only go so far as to say that nobody's opinion carries more weight than his among the Indian population. It comes, therefore, to this, that in Sir Henry Norman India will have a Viceroy who has not only distinguished himself alike in civil and in military affairs, but is specially equipped by his civil experience for the work of Indian administration, and disposed in the most vital of all India's military questions, to pursue a reasonable policy. Had Lord Roberts been appointed India would have been blessed with the "spreadeagle" policy *in excelsis*. From this fate, at any rate, she has been saved by the selection of a strenuous opponent of that policy as exemplified by the late Lord Lytton. But comparisons are odious, and we have said more than enough to show that Sir Henry Norman is not to be condemned untried. To put the matter on no higher ground, what could be more inexpedient than that those who wish well to India should hasten to censure a prospective ruler before they have had an opportunity of judging the character of his policy? Premature and groundless complaints do not as a rule redound to the advantage of their authors, and anything which tended to alienate Sir Henry Norman from sympathy with India's just claims would be in the last degree deplorable. But we anticipate nothing so unfortunate. On the contrary we incline, for many reasons, to the belief that in Sir Henry Norman, closely associated as he has been with Lord Ripon in Colonial politics, India will have a distinguished Viceroy and—a still better possession—a true friend.

[*₊* We regret that, since the foregoing article was printed, Sir Henry Norman has withdrawn his acceptance of the Viceroyalty of India "on the ground that, on further consideration, he does not feel that his strength and power of work are equal to so arduous a post." We hope that it may not yet be too late for Sir Henry Norman to reconsider his decision.—Ed. India.]

THE HINDU-MUSSULMAN RIOTS.

We cannot congratulate the Government upon the policy which they have seen fit to adopt in regard to the deplorable riots between Hindus and Mussulmans in India. Unfortunately, these outbreaks of disorder are not now heard of for the first time, and it was to be expected that in view of their frequent recurrence and, it must be added, their growing intensity, the Government would be prepared to take special steps to discover their causes, whether immediate or remote, particular or general. On August 28th, in the House of Commons, Sir W. Wedderburn asked the Under Secretary of State for India whether Lord Kimberley would lay upon the table of the House the reports received by him from the Government of India with regard to the riots at Azamgarh, Balia, Rangoon, Bombay, and other places; and whether he would direct the Government of India to appoint a mixed Commission of official and non-official members "to investigate the causes of such riots, and report on the best means to be adopted to remove these causes." Mr. G. Russell's answer to the latter part of the question was, not to put too fine a point on it, amazing. So far as the reports were concerned, the reply was that the only reports, other than telegrams, received at the India Office related to the riots in Rangoon, and that, if moved for, they would be laid on the table. Mr. Russell added that a telegram was received from the Viceroy on July 4th, relating to the Azamgarh riots, and telegrams on the 12th, 13th, and 14th inst., from the Governor of Bombay, relating to the riots in Bombay. These telegrams had been communicated to the newspapers, and the Secretary of State had not received official reports on the riots in the North-Western Provinces and in Bombay. So far so good. But Mr. Russell's answer to Sir W. Wedderburn's request for a mixed Commission of Inquiry can be compared only with the reason he has since advanced for charging the Indian revenues with half the cost of the Opium Commission. "As my hon. friend is aware, religious riots are," said the Under Secretary, "of almost annual recurrence in India, and the Secretary of State does not, as at present advised, think it necessary to direct the Government of India to appoint a Commission as suggested by my hon. friend." In other words, the disease is so severe that there is no need to call in a physician and obtain a diagnosis. The reply deserves to be chronicled among the curiosities of the India Office. The official mind, it would seem, runs in categories that are unknown to the mind of the layman. The reasons which would incline the latter to pursue a certain course of conduct, incline the official to refrain from it.

In a later reply Mr. Russell was a little less unsatisfactory.* On August 31st, Mr. Naoroji, on behalf of Sir W. Wedderburn, asked whether the Secretary of State for India would lay upon the table of the House a return of the Hindu-Mussulman riots which had occurred during the last five years, showing how each riot had originated, how it was dealt with, and how many persons were killed and wounded. Mr. Naoroji asked, also, whether the Secretary of State would call for a special

report from the Government of India regarding the disturbances this year at Azamgarh, Balia, Bareilly, and Bombay, showing how these disturbances originated, why they were becoming more frequent than in past years, and how they would be provided against in future. "The Secretary of State is not," replied Mr. Russell, "in possession of the full information which would enable a report for the last five years to be prepared, but he will ask the Government of India to send home with the local reports on the recent riots a general report covering the points enumerated by my hon. friend in the second paragraph of his question." Well, such a report is better than no report at all. But we are strongly of opinion that, in the special circumstances, the Government would have adopted a far wiser course if they had directed the Government of India to appoint a mixed commission of inquiry. It is no reflection upon officials in India to say that the findings of a tribunal containing a sprinkling of non-official members are likely to have more weight both in England and in India than an admittedly official report. Officials are doubtless excellent persons but their excellence is, after all, human, and where the questions at stake are so grave it would have been well for them and for us to obtain the verdict of a more obviously impartial jury. We think, therefore, and shall continue to think that the right course was to inquire by means of a mixed commission. The Government, however, have in their wisdom determined otherwise, and have consented to ask the Government of India for a special report. Until that report is forthcoming sensible and right-minded men will regard the whole question as *sub judice*, and refrain from passing premature and one-sided judgments upon the intricate questions under review. We have only to glance at the columns of the newspapers, whether Indian or British, to perceive the supreme unwisdom of such hasty inference. The suggestion that the Government of India have not always been careful to avoid the dangerous policy briefly described by the maxim "Divide and Rule," raises many an indignant protest. But the authors of the protests are not always felicitous in their methods. The *Times* of September 18th, devoted two whole columns of its fortnightly article on "Indian affairs" to a discussion of the recent riots, and the upshot of the discussion was that the blame rested with the Hindus. The uninformed reader who drew his conclusions from that article would inevitably leave it with the impression that the Mussulmans were a harmless, innocent, unobtrusive set of men, and that they had been the victims of a series of wanton and barbarous attacks at the hands of the Hindus. Now, this is not as it should be. We expect something better, something more judicial, from the writer of "Indian Affairs."

Unfortunately, the Anglo-Indian newspapers have been guilty of the same offence in an aggravated form. Do they hope by these methods to mitigate the antipathies of Hindus and Mussulmans? If they do, they have curious notions of the probabilities of things. But the *Times* and the *Pioneer* are not the only offenders. Sir Charles Crosthwaite's speech at Azamgarh must have been read with much uneasiness by his numerous friends. From beginning to end of this remarkable tirade the assumption is that the Hindus were the aggressors, that the recent riots were the results of Hindu organisation, and that they were connived at by landowners, schoolmasters, and police. Let us quote by no means the most offensive passage: "I can see how very bitter is the feeling between the Hindus and the Muhammadans which the late proceedings have caused. If those feelings are not allayed, if by persevering in aggression upon the liberty of the Muhammadans those feelings are excited to a further degree, there will be very great difficulty in restoring concord, and much danger of fresh rioting and bloodshed." Is language of this sort worthy of an official in Sir Charles Crosthwaite's position? Again, the Governor of Bombay has issued a warning against certain "incendiary literature" which is supposed to have been one of the causes of the riots. Whereupon, the *Pioneer* attributes this "incendiary literature" exclusively to the Hindu community. We deprecate with the utmost earnestness these premature attempts to assign responsibility. Nothing could be more discreditable, or more likely to ignite inflammable material. We have no intention of arguing that the boot is on the other leg. We are aware that the *Pioneer*, so soon as the recent resolution upon simultaneous examinations was adopted by the House of Commons, declared that Mussulmans would fight Hindus on the question tooth-and-nail; that the *Times* went out of its way to associate the Bombay riots with the demand for simultaneous examinations; and that when appeals are made in vain to intelligent and educated Mussulmans they may still have weight with the ignorant and hot-headed. We know, also, that the Hindus are not a proselytising community, nor fanatics in religious matters. But we do not press these points. What we do say is that it is the height of unwisdom in officials or their supporters to heap censure upon Hindus and to refrain from awarding any blame whatever to Mussulmans. The imperative need at the present time is that the balance should be held equally between the antagonists, and that counsels of moderation should prevail on both sides. It is the business of statesmanship to soften hostilities between various sections of a population, and to encourage harmony. Whatever temporary end may be served by the opposite policy, it is foredoomed to abject failure in the long run. We notice, by the way, that some English journals have had the audacity to state or to imply that the riots have in part been due to the propagandist work of the Indian National Congress. The insinuation is too childish to deserve an answer. It is not made in any Indian paper, and for a very simple reason—any Indian paper that made it would be holding itself up to ridicule.

Mr. J. Seymour Keay, M.P., writes that, in the debate on the Indian Budget, as Radical and Irish members were prepared to vote for the motion for inquiry, the Government would have had to grant it had not Mr. Morton pressed his motion. Only one amendment could be put.

THE OPIUM COMMISSION.

We have it on the authority of Mr. Boswell that Dr. Johnson, passing on a certain occasion a fishmonger who was skinning an eel alive, heard him "curse it because it would not lie still." Now, to say that India is very much in the position of that eel, and the British Government very much in the position of the fishmonger, would be to mingle truth with harshness. Only there would be truth in the comparison notwithstanding. It would seem at all events that India is expected to look tamely on while her meagre resources are drained to maintain a vast army which she does not need, and a system of civil government which, if only her just claims were met, would be twice as efficient at half the cost. Perhaps, therefore, as this appears to be the official notion of fair dealing where India is concerned, we should be mistaken if we thought that Mr. G. Russell was perpetrating a grim piece of humour when, on September 2nd, he explained to Mr. Curzon the decision of the Government to saddle India with half the cost of the Opium Commission. "The ground," said the Under-Secretary, "on "which it has been decided that half the cost of the "Opium Commission shall be borne by Indian "revenues is the great extent to which India's "financial position is involved in the inquiry." This is probably not a joke. The scriptural injunction, it is true, has not usually been interpreted in the sense that when a man is about to steal your coat he is justified in smiting you on both cheeks on the strength of the extent to which your personal comfort is involved. Nor, if one stole a cripple's crutch in order to break his second leg, could he reasonably plead the extent to which his victim's means of locomotion were involved. But when it comes to Indian finance the case is different. A Commission, for which India has not asked, is appointed to conduct an inquiry which may have the effect of curtailing the Indian revenues. Inquiry, for which India has long asked, into the extravagant expenditure incurred in her name, and into the best modes of retrenchment in case her income should be diminished, is not granted. Therefore, owing to "the great extent to which India's financial position "is involved," she is charged with one half of the expenses of the Commission. It is not stated that Mr. Russell smiled when he made the announcement. There are no grounds for believing that it appeared to him to be in any degree unusual or grotesque. On the contrary, it represents faithfully enough the treatment which India commonly receives in such matters, and it is precisely for that reason that it cannot be passed without notice.

Discussing this subject in a recent letter to the *Times*, Sir G. Chesney wrote: "Such a claim would "never be ventured upon if an inquiry of a similar "kind were entered upon in regard to any self-"governing colony, and that India is necessarily "without representative institutions, and its people "have not the means of making known their "grievances, while the local Government is perforce "bound to silence even when its opinions as to "what is just to India in such matters are over-"ridden by the authorities in this country—these "conditions, peculiar to the case of India, should "make our own Government scrupulously careful "not to abuse its autocratic powers by doing a wrong "to the silent and helpless Indian taxpayer. In "cases of doubt as to whether a charge should fall "properly on the Indian or the British exchequer, "India should in justice get the benefit of the "doubt. But in this instance there is no room "for doubt. If ever there was a case where the "English Treasury was bound in honour and "common honesty to pay the expenses incurred by "the action of its own Legislature and Government, "it is this. The proposed inquiry has arisen wholly "and solely at the instance of a body of faddists, "supported by an agitation got up among the "people of this country, honest and well-meant, but "based upon representations one-sided and in-"accurate to a degree that would be ludicrous were "not the consequences so serious. Not one man in "one million of the people of India wants this "inquiry; to say that the importance of their in-"terests involved justifies making them pay for it is "so transparently sophistical as to render comment "needless." We may agree with Sir G. Chesney's main contention without at all committing ourselves to the opinion which he seems to entertain of the opponents of the opium traffic. The *Times* discounted the value of an otherwise sensible protest by vague fulminations against the "anti-opium agitators." It was, in fact, content to assert that "like so many "other things, the Opium Commission is part of the "price of keeping the Separatist majority together." Perhaps, after all, it is not surprising that the newspaper which ascribed the Bombay riots to the resolution in favour of simultaneous examinations, cannot discuss the Opium Commission without a side-thrust at Home Rulers. But these things do not count. We can surely recognise the thorough disinterestedness and the high patriotism of men like Mr. W. S. Caine and Sir Joseph Pease without approving of the mode in which the cost of the Commission is to be defrayed. That is not their business. It is the business of the Government who, having granted the Commission in response to demands not made in India, cannot fairly ask India to pay part of the bill. We hope that even now it is not too late for wiser counsels to prevail. All men have virtue enough to regret the shortcomings of others; but to undertake an uninvited mission at the expense of the unregenerate is hardly a conciliatory method. In these circumstances the Government's decision must, we may presume, seem specially unfortunate to those who are most concerned for the prohibition of the opium-traffic. How can it appear satisfactory to the Government themselves? It has caused widespread dissatisfaction in India. It is condemned by fair-minded observers in this country without distinction of party. We may reasonably expect that the demand of such a chorus of voices will not be ignored, and that the Government will perceive the unwisdom of incurring so much odium to so little purpose.

Unfortunately this is far from being the only instance in which the principles of equity have been thrown to the winds in the adjustment of charges

between India and the home Government. When India sends troops to succour British forces (as was the case in Egypt in 1882, and Suakin in 1885), the cost is borne by the Indian revenues. When, on the other hand, British troops are sent to India, the cost is, as Sir G. Chesney says, rigorously debited to that country. Sir G. Chesney sums up the position in one telling sentence—"there is no reciprocity in these matters." Precisely the same thing happens when a detachment of Indian cavalry is sent to London to take part in the festive opening of the Imperial Institute. The great benefits arising from that excursion are dearly purchased by India at the price of some thousands of pounds. Other instances are forthcoming in distressingly large numbers. Now, this is not fair. If India were the richest country in the world there would be no excuse for this one-sided policy. But since India is notoriously poor—impoverished these many years by gross extravagance on the part of governors who are not Indian—it is simply outrageous that this country should employ its ruling position to compel India to a perpetual game of "heads I win, tails you lose". India is not a land of ingratitude. On the contrary no people is quicker to recognise fair dealing, nor to magnify an act of bare justice into a considerable favour. The question is whether the British Government are not in danger of putting an undue strain on this grateful temper, and of provoking to discontent a disposition which, under ordinary circumstances, is easily pleased. If it were really the case that the Commission had been appointed to inquire into the whole question of Indian public finance no complaint would be made. We can only hope that, under Lord Brassey, its investigations may travel as far as possible in this direction. Under the third clause setting forth its functions it is, indeed, appointed to consider the effect on the finances of India of the prohibition of the sale and export of opium, taking into consideration, (*a*) the amount of compensation payable, (*b*) the cost of the necessary preventive measures, (*c*) the loss of revenue. The Indian population will watch with some curiosity the interpretation that is put upon this clause. It admits, doubtless, some latitude of inquiry. But what was imperatively wanted was an express order to discover, if possible, means of economy which, on the removal of one source of income, would, in effect, supply another. Mr. Caine's resignation is as deeply to be regretted as the ill-health which made it necessary. The Commission would have had in him an invaluable ally, and India a trusted friend.

SUMMARY OF THE EVIDENCE.

It is impossible in the space at our disposal to give a full report of the evidence taken before the Royal Commission on the Indian Opium Trade, but the following summary aims at presenting its substance. The Commission was appointed to consider—1. Whether the growth of the poppy and manufacture and sale of opium in British India should be prohibited except for medical purposes, and whether such prohibition could be extended to the native States. 2. The nature of the existing arrangements with the native States in respect of the transit of opium through British territory, and on what terms, if any, these arrangements could be with justice terminated. 3. The effect on the finances of India of the prohibition of the sale and export of opium, taking into consideration (*a*) the amount of compensation payable, (*b*) the cost of the necessary preventive measures, (*c*) the loss of revenue. 4. Whether any change short of total prohibition should be made in the system at present followed for regulating and restricting the opium traffic and for raising a revenue therefrom. 5. The consumption of opium by the different races and in the different districts of India, and the effect of such consumption on the moral and physical condition of the people. 6. The disposition of the people of India in regard to (*a*) the use of opium for non-medical purposes, (*b*) their willingness to bear in whole or in part the cost of prohibitive measures. Lord Brassey presided.

September 8th.

Sir Joseph Pease, M.P., was the first witness, and gave evidence on behalf of the Anti-Opium Society. His contention was that there had never been such a peculiar case in the history of the world as the connection between the Government of India and the opium trade. The point to which he would draw attention was that it was carried out as a cultivation and a manufacture by the State—the State tried by every possible means to obtain fresh and larger sales for the drug. The Society that he represented had always considered the opium trade an immoral trade, and that was the ground of their agitation against it. It was a trade that was carried on greatly to the detriment of the human race. Opium was a drug that was treated by the English law as a poison that should only be sold for medicinal purposes. But in India it was not grown and manufactured for medicinal purposes at all. The bulk of the production was sent to China for consumption by the people there, and was not used by the Indian people themselves. The argument was used that if we did not supply China with opium China would supply herself, but he contended that we had no right to do what was wrong if it was wrong in itself because someone else was ready to do the wrong if we did not do it. His contention was that if Indian opium was kept out of China the great incentive to its cultivation by the Chinese themselves would be removed. Asked as to the proportion of Indian opium that was exported compared with the total amount produced, the witness said that in 1880-1 116,000 cwt. were exported to China, and in 1890-1 that quantity had fallen to ·94,000 cwt., while the amount consumed in India itself did not amount to more than 4,000 to 6,000 cwt. a year. To the Straits Settlements, also, 14,000 cwt. were exported in 1880-1, and 20,000 cwt. in 1890-1. His Society was more concerned to stop the export of the drug to China than to prohibit its use in India. Of late years a large amount of care had been exercised by the Government officials to restrict the use of the drug in India, and on that fact he based his contention that the moral evils resulting from the use of opium were acknowledged. With reference to the

amount of revenue derived by the Government of India from opium, the total in 1880-1 was Rs.845.10.000, and in 1892-3 the estimate of revenue was Rs.539.90.000. These figures showed a considerable diminution in the revenue derived from the drug. With regard to the mode in which the trade in opium had been dealt with by China, the witness said in 1834 the Chinese Government issued a decree against the importation of opium. In 1839 the first war between China and this country took place, and in 1842 Mr. Pottinger attempted to introduce in the Treaty of Nankin a recognition of the right to import the drug, but was unsuccessful. In 1857 a resolution condemning Mr. Bowring's conduct on this subject was carried in the House of Commons, but on Lord Palmerston's appealing to the country he was reinstated in power, and then followed the Treaty of Tientsin, by which opium was admitted to China on payment of a certain duty, and it had been there ever since. The view he had expressed as to the immorality of the opium traffic was supported by the feeling of the country, as indicated by memorials and petitions to Parliament and the Government from Christian ministers of all denominations, by Indian and Chinese missionaries, and by the expressions of opinion by leading public men. In support of this contention he quoted first a statement made by Lord Cornwallis, Governor-General of India in 1817, to the effect that the measures which had been taken regarding opium cultivation had been taken not with a view of increasing the revenue, but with a hope that they would tend to restrict the use of the poisonous drug to cases in which it was absolutely necessary from a medicinal point of view. Lord Cornwallis concluded, "If it is possible to prevent the use of the drug altogether except as a medicine we would gladly do it out of compassion to mankind." Coming down to 1876, Lord Salisbury, then Secretary of State for India, stated to a deputation on the subject of the Bengal opium traffic that the Government did not view with any favour the extension of the existing system, and he felt that there were "inconveniences of principle"—a curious phrase, the witness remarked—connected with the trade which would prevent any Government in the present day introducing such a trade, and which would prevent him and the Government he represented from in any way pushing it. About the same time Mr. Bourke, the Under Secretary, said he had never heard anyone say anything in favour of the opium traffic from a moral point of view. In 1879 Mr. Gladstone said that the opium revenue must always be accepted with more or less compunction and regret as administering to present necessities, but we had no right to reckon on its full continuance. Then Sir James Fergusson, while Governor of Bombay, protested against the introduction of an industry so demoralising in its tendency as was the opium trade into any province where hitherto it had been unknown, and he objected to the introduction of the cultivation into the Presidency of Bombay on grounds of public morality. The late Mr. W. H. Smith also stated that the course which the Government of India had followed for fifteen years, ending with 1890, had been to diminish the area under poppy cultivation, and there had been an actual diminution of 20 per cent., and that was a policy which the Government would pursue in the future. As a matter of fact there had been a considerable reduction in the acreage under cultivation, from 594,921 acres in 1885-6 to 463,665 acres in 1891-2. The witness next gave an account of the various motions made and the divisions taken in the House of Commons on the question of restricting the opium trade. In 1870 a motion by Sir Wilfrid Lawson was defeated by 150 against 46. In 1875 a motion by Mr. M. Stewart was lost by 94 against 57. In 1883 the majority against the motion was 126 against 66, and in 1889 Mr. Samuel Smith's motion was defeated by 165 against 88. But in 1891 the House of Commons affirmed the principle that the trade was morally indefensible by carrying at his (the witness's) instigation an amendment to a motion that the Speaker leave the chair by 160 against 129. Asked as to what justification he had for believing that the constituencies supported his view of the question, he said that he had attended meetings in all parts of England and in Scotland, and on no other subject had he seen such large meetings and so much enthusiasm. With regard to public opinion in other countries with respect to the use of opium, he said that in California there was a State law forbidding the use of the drug except for medicinal purposes, and a law of the same kind had recently been passed in Victoria, Australia. China had also, in treaties with America and Russia, taken care to prohibit the importation of opium from those countries. He then read at length extracts from the published opinions of medical men, missionaries, and others as to the evils produced by opium-smoking, the effect of these being that where the habit prevailed it inflicted more terrible evils on the population than even the drinking of spirits and drunkenness.

The CHAIRMAN said he supposed the witness recognised that the Indian Government must raise a certain revenue, and that in the present financial position there would be great difficulty in finding another source of revenue if the opium revenue were relinquished.

The witness said that of course when the Government found that it had not enough money to meet its expenditure it must either increase its revenue or reduce the expenditure. But he would point out that the revenue from opium was now within a far more reasonable compass than it formerly was. At present it amounted to about Rs.500.00.000, out of a total revenue of Rs.8,800.00.000, or, roughly speaking, £5,000,000 out of a total revenue of £88,000,000. Within ten years the opium revenue had decreased £3,000,000. The Indian Government had got on without this £3,000,000, and when he considered that within the same period the military expenditure had increased by some £8,000,000, while he was not prepared to say that this military expenditure was useless or unnecessary, and while he would not say whether the frontier policy and the annexation policy was or was not a wise policy, yet he could not help thinking that if reforms in Indian expenditure were properly carried out, and the resources of India developed, the opium revenue would prove a very small item and an inconsiderable loss if it were relinquished.

The Rev. James Legge, professor of the Chinese language and literature at Oxford, said he had resided many years in China and Malacca as a missionary. He never heard a man who had a word to say in the way of apology or excuse for the opium habit, and he did not believe they would find a man in all China, even amongst opium smokers, who would say a word in its favour.

Lord Brassey: The Chinese are very industrious, are they not, and physically strong?—Witness: Yes. They are the most industrious race I ever came across, but the opium smokers cannot work as well as non-smokers.

By Sir J. Lyall: Very little alcoholic liquor was drunk in China. During thirty-four years he had only seen one man drunk, and he was not very drunk.

By Mr. Arthur Pease: I never knew a man go on for fifteen or twenty years taking opium without becoming a slave to it. If that has been said by anyone, it is contrary to my experience.

By Sir W. Roberts: The quantity of opium grown in China was perhaps five times as much as that which came from India. Ten per cent. of the whole population of China smoked opium.

Dr. Maxwell, formerly a medical missionary in China, and at present Secretary to the Medical Mission in London, said he had resided for many years in Formosa, where he conducted a dispensary which was largely attended by persons seeking relief from the opium habit. He calculated that no fewer than 20,000 persons, seeking to escape from the bondage, passed through the hands of medical missionaries annually.

September 10th.

The Rev. Joseph Adams, of the American Baptist Mission, said that he had laboured for thirteen years in the valley of the Yangtse-kiang. For four years was in Upper Burma. The Burmese authorities were strongly opposed to the use of opium by their people. The reasons for this prohibition, as given by the leading men in Burma, were—first, that the people were so weak in the face of the temptations offered by opium and alcohol; secondly, that the Burmese religion forbids their use; and, thirdly, that there were ancient laws of Burma prohibiting the trade in these drugs. The effect of opium-smoking upon the Chinese was very disastrous, resulting in emaciation and decay of the faculties. In all fever epidemics his experience was that the opium-smokers were the first to be attacked and the soonest to succumb; the healthier non-smoking coolies stood the fever far better. There seemed to be little doubt that the total prohibition of the trade was the only way to effectually put down opium-smoking, and he believed public opinion in Burma would support the Government in such a policy. The opinion of the missionaries in Burma and the 20,000 native Christians were unanimous in condemning the introduction of the opium trade into Burma, and they were equally strong in their opposition to alcohol. It was the unanimous belief of all the missionaries that the Chinese Government were anxious to deal with the opium trade, but were not free to do so long as they were handicapped by the foreign imports of the drug. A vast majority of the higher officials in China were strongly opposed to opium; but no doubt among the lower officials, who were very poor, there were many who supplemented their incomes by receiving bribes to allow things to go on that they ought to put a stop to.

By Sir James Lyall: Previous to Upper Burma being taken over by the Indian Government no Burmese, to his knowledge, smoked opium. In the parts of China with which he was acquainted he could certainly say that opium-smoking was not nearly so common as tobacco-smoking was in England.

The Rev. J. Hudson Taylor, a Baptist missionary in China and a member of the Royal College of Surgeons, said he had had a wide opportunity of forming an opinion as to the effect of the opium trade and opium-smoking on the people of China. The effects of opium on the Chinese were, first, to interfere with the nutritive system. An opium-smoker rapidly lost appetite. Then it had a deleterious effect upon the nervous system, causing nervous irritability and sleeplessness, which can only be palliated by further recourse to the drug. Further, it had a serious effect upon the generative system, and in cases where both husband and wife were opium-smokers the children were weakly, of low vitality, and fell easy victims to infantile diseases. Mentally, opium-smokers suffered terrible depression when the effect of the stimulant had passed off. A confirmed opium-smoker seemed to have lost all his moral perceptions and all sense of the difference between right and wrong. The best classes in China unanimously attributed to us the ruin of their population.

September 13th.

Mr. Benjamin Broomhall, General Secretary of the China Inland Mission, said that he had not himself resided in China, but the information which he had from time to time received from missionaries in China, in the shape of communications and personal communications, left upon his mind the profound conviction that opium-smoking in its effects was physically, morally, and socially one of the most awful vices that was ever inflicted upon the world. Witness put before the Commission the reports that had been received from the various provinces of China bearing upon the question. From Yunan the report was that the ravages of opium-smoking in that remote district were very great. The habit was undermining the whole structure of society; it pervaded all classes, rich and poor alike, and under its evil effects China, in the opinion of the agent, was being whirled to its ruin. Between eighty and ninety per cent. of the adult male population smoked opium, and twenty or thirty per cent. of the women. From the western province of Kwei-Chou it was reported that fifty to seventy per cent. of the whole population smoked opium, and the effects were no less serious than in Yunan. The reports from the largest province of China—Si-Chuen—were of a similar character, but it was said that there it was the poorer classes who were principally affected, the better classes not having given themselves to the habit to such an extent. Similar repor s had been received from the

central province of Shen-si and the northern province of Shan-si. In these provinces nearly three-quarters of the cultivated land was occupied by opium. The name of England was hated, and from this cause the greatest hindrances were thrown in the way of the work of the missionaries.

Lord Brassey: From what you have said there seems to be no doubt that this rapid spread of the habit had been fed chiefly by the increase in the cultivation of native opium and not by the importation of foreign opium, and that there has been great laxity on the part of the Chinese officials in permitting the cultivation?

Witness: That is so, no doubt, but the reason why the cultivation has been allowed is that the Chinese Government found that millions of rupees were going out of the country for the purchase of Indian opium, and in order to keep this money in the country the cultivation of the drug at home was allowed. In his opinion, if the process went on at the present rate, in another fifty years the population of China would be practically destroyed.

By Sir William Roberts: It was certainly his strong conviction that so long as the importation of Indian opium was permitted, the Chinese Government could not take steps, with any hope of being successful, to check the cultivation of native opium.

Mr. Graham Brown, a lay missionary who had laboured for six years in the city of Lan Chou, the capital of the province of Kan Suh, an inaccessible district in the north-west of China, bore testimony to the terrible effects which the habit of opium-smoking was inflicting upon the people. It was less than fifty years since the first opium-smoker appeared in the district, and not more than thirty years since the drug was first cultivated in the district. Now eight-tenths of the adult male population and six-tenths of the married women were given up to the habit.

By Sir James Lyall: He believed that if the Indian Government stopped the export of opium, the Mandarins of the Chinese provinces would do their best to put down the habit of opium-smoking, and if they were allowed a free hand he believed it would very quickly be done. It was a fact that Indian opium in China was a luxury of the rich in the same way that French brandy was a luxury in this country, but to follow the analogy it was doubtful whether, if the production of Scotch and Irish whisky was stopped in this country, French brandy would not become a more common drink.

The Rev. A. Elwin, who had been a missionary of the Church Missionary Society for twenty-three years in the city of Hung-Chow, spoke of the disastrous effects of opium-smoking on the labouring population.

By Sir James Lyall: He certainly believed that if Indian opium had not been introduced into China there would have been no native cultivation of the drug.

Mr. Marcus Wood, a lay missionary, who had travelled in several Chinese provinces, said the habit of opium-smoking had become very common, not so much, perhaps, among the agricultural labourers as among the artisans of the large towns.

By Mr. Mowbray, M.P.: Smokers and non-smokers alike hated England for her connection with the trade.

Mr. Fletcher Brown, of the Methodist Episcopalian Church, who had been a missionary in China for ten years, stated that on his return to England he had been entrusted with three petitions to the Queen, signed by over 1,000 native Christians of China, in favour of the discontinuance of the importation of Indian opium into China.

Brigade Surgeon Pringle, of the Indian Army, considered that the habitual use of opium was harmful physically and morally. With regard to the attitude of the Indian Government on the opium question, as a public servant he would only say that their policy on that subject was so utterly opposed to all that they had otherwise done for the elevation of the people that he could not reconcile it with the object they had in view. He did not deny that it would be difficult to withdraw the use of opium altogether from those who were confirmed users of the drug, but it was possible to remove the temptation to indulge if the facilities for obtaining the drug were removed.

Lord Brassey asked if the witness had any practical suggestion to make as to Government action in the matter.

The witness said that he would simply suggest that the drug should be cultivated and used only for medicinal purposes, and that this should be done under Government supervision, as was the case with other poisonous drugs. He had no doubt that such a policy would be welcomed by all classes in India, except, perhaps, in the case of some of the opium-smokers themselves.

Dr. Swanson, who had resided for twenty-one years in the South of China in connection with the Presbyterian Mission, said that up to 1880 there was very little opium grown in his district, but since then the cultivation had extended. He confirmed all that previous witnesses had said as to the terrible effects of opium-smoking.

Mr. Donald Matheson, of the firm of Jardine, Matheson and Co., who had been engaged for many years in the opium trade with China and was present in Canton during the opium difficulties in 1839 and following years, said that his experience of the evils of opium-smoking led him to the conclusion that the traffic was an immoral one, and he had relinquished business in consequence.

September 14th.

Sir John Strachey, a member of the Indian Council, read extracts from a paper read by Mr. Batten before the Society of Arts, and said that these views he entirely endorsed. The conclusion he had come to as the result of a life's experience was that the use of opium in moderation did not only cause

none of the miseries that had been described, but, so far from being harmful, was actually beneficial. Certain classes of the people of India had consumed opium from times immemorial, but these classes comprised so small a proportion of the total population that so far as India was concerned there was really no opium question at all. It had been said that the use of the drug was spreading in India, and was encouraged by the policy of the British Government. That was not true. The population of India had largely increased during the British occupation, while the consumption of opium had actually diminished, and was certainly smaller now than it was ten years ago. This had been the effect of the policy of the Indian Government, which by constantly increasing the Excise duties had reduced the consumption in India to a minimum. The danger was that they might go too far in that direction. By making opium too dear they would encourage smuggling, which was a small matter, but they might also drive the people of India to the use of cheaper and far more noxious drugs which were growing at their very doors. As to the effect of the use of opium upon the physical development of the people, the drug was used most extensively by Rajputanas and Sikhs, and these were without exception the finest, strongest, and most handsome races of India—the very flower of our army, and among the very finest races of the whole earth. With regard to China, there was no greater delusion than the supposition that China was dependent upon India for its opium supply. If no opium were exported from India it would not make the slightest difference in the consumption in China. In China Indian opium was the luxury of the rich. A single province of China produced more opium than was produced in the whole of India. If India was deprived of the opium revenue it would be an act of folly and injustice such as had never been inflicted upon a dependent people. England was, in fact, asked to sacrifice the welfare of the millions of her Indian subjects, whom she was bound to protect on the chance only of doing some remote good to a people as to whom she had no responsibility whatever. The cultivation of the poppy was actually prohibited throughout the Bombay Presidency, and the small native States included in that Presidency also agreed to prohibit the cultivation in their borders and to prevent smuggling. So far as the Bombay Presidency was concerned, therefore, the interference of the Government of India was confined wholly to the imposition of an export duty. In the case of the Madras Presidency, of course, a different state of things prevailed, the Government being, in fact, a grower and manufacturer of opium. He could make no suggestion as to any means by which the growth and manufacture of the drug could be prevented in the native States, as he believed such a thing was quite impracticable. As to the effect upon the revenue of India of the prohibition of the export of opium, he considered that the mere question of the five or six crores of rupees of revenue derived by the Government from export duty was a very small question. The real question was the value of the crop itself. The duty received by the Government was of no greater importance in view of the total value to India of the opium cultivation and manufacture than in this country was the excise revenue derived from spirits and beer compared with the total value of those trades to the country. The total value of the poppy crop had been estimated at 19,150,000 tens of rupees, and the value of the exports of poppyseeds alone at 500,000 tens of rupees. It was impossible to say what would be the total cost to India of the suppression of the cultivation of opium supposing that such a thing was practicable. The value of the crop to which he had referred included the whole of the profits made by all parties out of the crop, and it represented somewhere about £13,000,000 at the present time, but a few years ago it represented £19,000,000, the difference being caused by the fluctuation in the rate of exchange. At the same time, these fluctuations had not affected the value of the crop to the cultivators themselves. He thought it was idle to talk of compensation for the suppression of such an industry as this. It might conceivably be possible for a strong Government like the Indian Government to effectually suppress the cultivation, but how compensation could be adequately given he could not conceive. His opinion was that if the British Government made India a present of £100,000,000 it would be a very small compensation for the destruction of a whole industry like that of opium. Then as to the effect upon the actual revenue of India. Formerly the opium revenue was about 8,000,000 tens of rupees; now it was 5,000,000 tens of rupees, the reduction being due to the extension of the cultivation of the drug in China, and the partial failure of the crops in India in recent years. The Budget estimate for the present year was 5,750,000 tens of rupees, including Excise. As to how the loss of 5,750,000 tens of rupees of revenue could be made good, he certainly could suggest no means. It was useless to talk about any reduction of expenditure; so far as he could see the expenditure must inevitably go on increasing in India, as in all other countries. As to the effect upon the physical and moral welfare of the people of the use of opium, he said the only portion of the country under English rule where it was alleged that injury was done was Burma. It was said that there was a general and strong desire among the Burmese people that the use of the drug should be altogether prohibited. If there was such a general concensus of opinion he agreed that as a question of practical government it was desirable to carry it into effect, even if it were unreasonable, and that had been actually done in Burma, where the use of the drug was entirely prohibited. At the same time there was a wonderfully unanimous expression of opinion as to the harmlessness of the drug in the case of the Chinese and other foreign populations in Burma.

Sir WILLIAM MOORE, who had been principal medical officer for many years in Rajputana, and had had altogether thirty-three years' experience in medical work in India, said he had investigated the question of the use of opium and its effects, and the result of his investigations was that opium smoking was practically harmless, and in many cases productive of very great benefit. A moderate use of the

drug brightened the intellect and strengthened the system physically and mentally.

By Sir WILLIAM ROBERTS: He had not distinguished between the effects of the drug on different races. He had associated daily with the Rajputanas, who were habitual users of opium, and they were the finest race in the country.

Dr. MOUAT, who had been for twenty years Inspector General of Prisons and Asylums in India, spoke of his experience of the physical conditions of the opium eaters who had come under his observation. He never saw healthier or stronger men than the opium-smokers were. This applied not only to natives of all parts of India, but to Chinamen who came into the prisons. Some of the men came from the north-west provinces of India, where the great majority of the people were opium users, and had been such for generation after generation. The part of the subject he had particularly studied was the relation of opium to crime and insanity. The statistics he had collected from a vast number of prisons showed that not a single instance of crime had ever been attributed to opium. Alcohol was not mentioned in the statistics. He was *ex officio* inspector of lunatic asylums, and the statistics on this subject relating to 74,000,000 of population showed that out of 2,241 admissions to the lunatic asylum only eight were attributed to opium. He maintained that the habitual use of opium in India was neither injurious, dangerous, nor immoral; that it had produced no deterioration in the people, physically or morally; that it was a valuable prophylactic in the case of malarious and other fevers, and that the suppression of its use was advocated on grounds that were unsound and unjust, and that if such suppression were carried into effect it would cause a great amount of suffering among the people, and would drive them to the use of other and more deleterious drugs for stimulants.

Sir GEORGE BIRDWOOD, formerly medical officer of the Bombay establishment of the Indian army, and now of the India Office, gave evidence as to the difficulty he had experienced in dealing with the European soldiers on account of their indulgence in spirits. On the other hand, the native troops gave no trouble whatever in that respect. Most of them were opium eaters, and they were always ready to march, and were perfectly steady.

Mr. H. N. LAY, C.B., who had resided for many years in China, showed that opium was brought into China from Persia and other Western States centuries ago. The Chinese Government had endeavoured to check the trade. But large quantities were smuggled into the country, and thirty years later the import was recognised by the Chinese Government.

(*Continued on page* 313.)

NOTICE.

INDIA will in future contain a "London Letter," dealing with the most interesting occurrences of the month in London.

RESIGNATION OF MR. STEPHENS.

THE following correspondence has passed between Mr. H. Morse Stephens, M.A., and the British Committee of the Indian National Congress:—

To Sir WILLIAM WEDDERBURN, Bart., M.P.,
Chairman of the British Committee of the Indian National Congress.

Dear Sir,—I have long felt it to be almost impossible for me to carry out adequately my duties as Editor of INDIA. My work at Cambridge will next term be heavier than before, as I have undertaken to assist in the instruction of candidates for the Indian Civil Service in addition to my present lectures to the selected candidates. Under these circumstances I feel it incumbent upon me to resign my post as Editor of INDIA.

It seems to me essential that the Editor of INDIA should reside in London, so as to be in touch with the House of Commons and with the current of political ideas there. My residence in Cambridge makes it impossible for me to fulfil this requirement, and I feel that it is, therefore, a duty I owe to the British Committee of the Indian National Congress to surrender the trust they conferred upon me. I need hardly observe that I did not clearly grasp the necessity of residing in London when I accepted the editorship, or I should never have accepted it.

I cannot conclude without expressing my gratitude to the members of the British Committee collectively and to yourself individually for the assistance which has always been readily given to me, and I need hardly say that while no longer officially connected with it, I shall nevertheless continue to take the keenest interest in the prosperity and progress of the Indian National Congress.

Believe me to be, dear Sir,
Yours faithfully,
(Signed) H. MORSE STEPHENS.
Aug. 24, 1893.

P.S.—My resignation of the editorship of INDIA naturally involves my retirement from the post of Honorary Secretary to the British Committee.

REPLY.

To H. MORSE STEPHENS, Esq.,

Dear Sir,—I have submitted to the British Committee of the Indian National Congress your letter of the 24th resigning the Editorship of INDIA on account of your increasing work at Cambridge. In accepting your resignation, I have been requested to communicate to you the thanks of the Committee for your past services, and to express their gratification that you will continue to take a warm interest in the prosperity and progress of the Congress movement.

(Signed) W. WEDDERBURN.
Palace Chambers, Westminster.
Aug. 29, 1893.

INDIA

is published on the 1st of each month in London, and will be despatched to India by the mail preceding or succeeding the day of publication, according to circumstances.

Supplements will be published, free to subscribers, from time to time, containing VERBATIM *reports of debates on Indian questions in Parliament, and documents of historical or current interest.*

The subscription to India *is 6s. a year for England and 6 rupees for India, post free.*

India *represents not only the political, but the literary and industrial revival of India, and appeals to all classes interested in the development of the country.*

All contributions, whether articles or paragraphs, will be carefully considered, and, when used, will be paid for, if payment is requested at the time of sending. Unused contributions will be returned, if a stamped and directed wrapper or envelope is enclosed, not otherwise.

Correspondence on Indian subjects generally is invited, but all letters must be authenticated by the real name and address of the writer.

It is intended to establish a special department, called 'India in England,' *if correspondents will kindly forward information of interest regarding Indian students and other Indians resident in the United Kingdom.*

The attention of publishers and editors of magazines is called to the scheme of publishing a monthly Indian Bibliography, *and their co-operation is invited.*

All communications for the Editor *must be addressed to the offices, 84 and 85,* Palace Chambers, London, S.W.

All remittances, subscriptions, orders for copies, etc., must be addressed to the Manager, *at the offices, 84 and 85,* Palace Chambers, London, S.W.

India *presents unique advantages as an* Advertising Medium. *All communications as to Advertisements must be sent to the Advertisement Manager, at the offices, 84 and 85, Palace Chambers, London, S.W.*

Copies of India *can be procured from the offices of the Paper, Mr.* Elliot Stock, *Paternoster Row, London, E.C., and from Messrs.* Deighton, Bell and Co., *Trinity Street, Cambridge. And to order at any Railway Bookstall*

INDIA.

LONDON, 1 OCTOBER, 1893.

HEALTH LECTURES FOR INDIAN VILLAGES.

By Miss Florence Nightingale.

Knowing the wide circulation which your journal enjoys among the educated classes in India, may I ask the favour of a little space to appeal to those classes to support and direct the efforts which are being made on behalf of the health of villagers and their families?

I observe that some Native journals express a fear that if Government undertakes village sanitation, the result will be increased taxation in some form. They also fear that the work of sanitation will be promoted "in accordance with European ideas," thereby weakening the sense of Indian nationality. I do not presume to say that these fears are without any foundation. But I desire to suggest the direction in which our Indian reformers might work, so as to obtain for their poorer brethren protection from the unsanitary evils which are now sapping their strength and vitality, without additional taxation, or trenching unduly upon national customs: on the contrary, by working through the villagers themselves, and teaching them to give the fullest effect to the admirable doctrines of their religion with regard to cleanliness and purity.

As regards the need of something being done to improve village surroundings there can be no doubt, and I see that a Native journal fully endorses the following remarks by Dr. Gregg on the difficulties of rural sanitation: "Rural sanitation," he says, "is "unknown in these provinces. No attention what- "ever is paid to conservancy or water-supply, and "stagnant ponds are allowed to exhale miasma "everywhere. The people are cleanly enough as "regards their persons and the interior of their "houses, but the surroundings of their villages are "often appallingly filthy. This has been and con- "tinues to be pointed out to them as the cause of "their unhealthiness, but it seems to be of no use "talking. . . . . Wells are dug for them and tanks "are excavated, but they will not set them apart for "special purposes, and obstinately use the water of "the same tank for washing their persons and "bathing their bodies, and washing their clothes, "and bathing and watering their cattle, and clean- "ing their utensils, and for drinking and culinary "purposes. So long as this disregard continues "there must be a large amount of sickness, disease, "and death in our villages." Such being the distressing condition of things, how can some remedy be found in accordance with the social and religious feeling of the people, and without imposing additional taxation on the villages? Does it not appear that a great part of the evil can be removed by the people themselves, without expense, if they can be persuaded to adopt a few simple precautions which will ward off suffering and loss from themselves and their children? There is a good old saying that every man should clean his own doorstep. That is common-sense and also public economy. The question is, How are the people to be persuaded? Dr. Gregg has said that "it seems to be of no use talking," and words without practical illustration are indeed idle words. It is also no doubt very difficult for those who are of a different race, and who hold an official position. But I cannot but think that the villagers would listen more readily if addressed by those who are of their own race and religion, and who exercise no authority as servants of the Government, especially if the lecture was illustrated by object lessons on the spot.

What I would therefore propose, is that the experiment should be tried of giving health lectures and demonstrations of a thoroughly popular kind in a few selected villages in different parts of India. And I would appeal to Indian Associations, interested in the material and social welfare of the people, to undertake this beneficent duty. I have on a previous occasion been in correspondence on this subject with the Poona Sarvajanik Sabha, so well-known for its knowledge of the needs of the villagers and its active efforts to supply them; and I feel confident that it will give a favourable hearing to this appeal, enlisting in the cause men desirous of following in the steps of the late Mr. Ganesh Wasedeo Joshi, who gave a bright example of unselfish devotion to the welfare of the people. My suggestion then is that, where this work is undertaken by a local association, a system of lectures should be organized, showing the villagers the need of (*a*) a better water supply, (*b*) the carrying away of sewage, and (*c*) the diminution of overcrowding; these lectures being given from village to village by men (1) well-versed themselves in the principles of sanitation, and (2) knowing the habits of the people and able to sympathize with and help them, without offending their prejudices. Probably the village schoolrooms might be utilised for the lectures, which might be made attractive by object-lessons with the magic-lanterns, showing the

noxious living organisms in foul air and water. Such preparations shown at the International Hygienic Congress produced a strong impression. But the lecture would only be the first beginning of the teaching; a lecturer who had made himself acceptable to the people would go round the village and show the people how to dispose of their refuse; he would explain to them the danger of depositing it in their little close courtyards, and how the solid should be separated from the liquid excreta, and the former utilised in their cultivation. Then he would go with them to examine their water supply, and show them certain simple precautions to be observed: not washing near the supply of drinking water, and not allowing human beings or cattle to foul the river, tank, or well. The Hindu religion enjoins so much purity and cleanliness that the influence of the religious teachers and of the caste Panchâyats might be usefully appealed to."

Now about the cost. I am aware how difficult it is to find funds for the current work of public associations. But could not a special fund be raised for this special urgent need? I know how, from ancient times up to the present day, large sums have always been forthcoming in India from charitable men and women for wells, tanks, hospitals, dispensaries, and other institutions for the public good. Would not the comparatively small sum required for the present experiment be forthcoming if the case were urgently represented to those having the means? Prevention is better than cure. If we can prevent disease by simple sanitary precautions it is a better religious act than relieving the person after he is stricken by disease. So strongly do I feel the need of such action that, if such a fund is started, I will, with the help of a few English friends, gladly send a small contribution as token of my earnest good will. Also, if an association submitted to Government a well considered scheme for such a system of health lectures, I should have great hopes that it would obtain a moderate grant of public money (equal perhaps to what is raised by private subscription) to help in carrying out this work. His Excellency the present Viceroy and other high authorities are deeply interested in the cause of sanitation, and if the association offered to furnish full reports of its operations, and to allow the grant to depend upon the results shown, it seems that a strong claim would be established for assistance in this good practical work for our poorer Indian brethren.

Florence Nightingale.

THE LATE HON. JUSTICE K. T. TELANG.

By John Adam, M.A.

Seldom has the telegraph flashed a message fraught with a deeper sense of national loss and personal bereavement, then when it sent news of the death of Kashinath Trimbak Telang. I was sitting on the terrace of the House of Commons with his old friends Sir William Wedderburn and Mr. W. C. Bonnerji, when a still older friend, Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, brought us the sad news. Some of us had seen him not so very long ago, Mr. Bonnerji, indeed, but in July—seen him bearing up against physical pain and bodily weakness, but with his intellect clear as ever, his wit as sharp, his smile as genial—and though we feared that the unrelenting gods had again set their seal upon one of those they love, we never realised that the end was so very near. The first thought, suggested by the surroundings, was that were India to send another of her sons to sit beside the member for Finsbury on the Benches of Parliament, she had lost the man who would by acclamation have been selected for the honour. India must, instead, mourn one of her wisest counsellors, one of her most brilliant scholars, one of her choicest speakers, and one of the best of men.

Mr. Telang's life was devoid of striking incident. He rose, before he was forty, to the highest official position to which a native of India can aspire, by shere dint of that rare combination of talents and qualities which make genius. Never was quotation more aptly applied than that prefixed to the short sketch of his life by Mr. Parekh, to which this notice is much indebted:—

> "In joys, in griefs, in triumphs, in retreat,
> "Great always without aiming to be great."

He belonged to a respectable and respected middle-class family, which came from Thana to Bombay in the early part of the century. His grandfather was a clerk in the celebrated firm of Messrs. Forbes and Co.; and Kashinath, the second son of the second son, was born in 1850, and adopted by his eldest uncle, Trimbak Rao, whose name he took. He passed through the ordinary school and college course with much distinction, and on taking his degree of Bachelor of Arts in 1867, was appointed Fellow of the Elphinstone College, a position which he held until 1872. During this time he continued his studies with ardour, took the degrees of Master in Arts and Bachelor in Law, gained high honours in Sanskrit, and finally, having passed the Advocate's Examination and kept the necessary terms, was called to the local Bar. Almost from the first he took a leading position. His knowledge of Hindu Law was recognised to be profound, and in this he was doubtless much aided by his Sanskrit lore. But he was no less an admirable advocate, and could state his law in a way that even the dullest judge—for even in India judges sometimes nod—could not fail to understand. He was offered but declined a subordinate judgeship in 1880; and in 1889 was raised to the Bench of the High Court, an appointment unanimously approved by English and Indians alike. Short as his career as a Judge was, and impeded by the worst of health, it yet proved worthy of the reputation by which he gained it.

Mr. Telang was, however, far from being absorbed in his profession. He flung himself with energy into the performance of the many duties that devolve on the good citizen. He was appointed a member of the Legislative Council of Bombay in 1884, and remained a member until he was raised to the Bench. He declined the Bombay membership of the Viceroy's Council—no busy professional man can accept that seat. He was created a Fellow of the University of Bombay in 1877, was elected a member of the Syndicate, or governing Committee, in 1881, and was finally nominated Vice-Chancellor last year. But his interest in and work for educa-

tion was not confined to the Senate House. In 1880 he was appointed a member of the Education Commission which overhauled the Department of Public Instruction throughout India in all its branches; and so thoroughly did he apply himself to the task that he embodied his views in a separate minute, which the President of the Commission has declared to be most valuable, and which won for him the honour of the Companionship of the Indian Empire. The later developments in the direction of technical education deeply interested him; and it must remain one of my most pleasant memories that I was closely associated with him in pressing this all-important subject upon the members assembled at the great Allahábád Congress of 1888.

I cannot mention the Congress without recalling what was, after all, that trait in Mr. Telang's character which most endeared him to the silent millions of his fellow-countrymen. There have been many Indians, with abilities perchance not inferior to his, who have deemed personal advancement to be the worthiest aim in life, and that the surest path thereto was the selfish one; that an attitude of self-repression degenerating into subserviency was the quickest way to "master's favour." Another race of men has been springing up, and has been brought prominently into notice by the public proceedings of the Congress. And of that band Mr. Telang was one of the most distinguished. No bigoted firebrand, no disappointed place-hunter with a grievance, on the contrary, the friend and trusted adviser of governors and councillors, with wealth and honours and troops of friends, he was ever the incorruptible patriot, the sternest critic of the Government when he thought it to be in the wrong, the sturdy champion of the lawful demands of his fellow-citizens. The quotations I shall make presently from some of his speeches will show the attitude he maintained throughout the stormy Viceroyships of Lords Lytton, Ripon, and Dufferin; but the strong interest and active personal share he took in the Congress movement are alone ample proof—were proof needed—of what I have claimed for him. In this respect he stands out to young India as a beacon of independence, not the crabbed, soured independence that refuses to look fairly on any side, but the honest and equal-minded independence that praises what is good and reprobates what is bad, wherever found. He at least had learned the right answer to the Roman's question,

"Invidiam placare paras, virtute relictâ?"

I have already mentioned that Mr. Telang was a Sanskrit scholar. Here, *inter alios*, his papers on the *Rámáyana* and the *Bhagavat-Gítá*, and his English translation of the latter, gained for him a European reputation. While his health held out he was a voluminous writer, and not only on Sanskrit literature; antiquities, political economy, political history, and Maráthá literature and history—all came alike to him; and in all his work was thorough, exact, and original. To the last subject in particular he devoted much of his later leisure. He had undertaken to prepare, in connection with Mr. Ranade and some other scholars, a sketch of Maráthá history for the "Epochs of Indian History" which I am editing. With characteristic modesty, he did not at first desire that his name should appear on the title-page, but with equally characteristic recognition of the additional value his imprimatur would give to it, he yielded to argument. His last letter to me informed me that the work was practically complete, and only wanted his finishing touches. Whether he has been able to give them or not, I do not yet know. A first fruit of his labours in this field will be found in his interesting "Gleanings from Maráthá Chronicles," contributed last year to the first series of "Deccan College Lectures." In recognition of his Oriental scholarship, he was chosen to succeed Sir Raymond West as President of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society.

As a speaker Mr. Telang possessed a perfect debating—I should say a perfect House of Commons—style. There was no impassioned eloquence, still less any trace of the demagogue, about his oratory. But neither was there an atom of halting or hesitation, either in the mental argument or in the verbal utterance. He reasoned with marvellous clearness and lucidity, straight and unflinchingly to his conclusion, and played upon the moods of an intellectual audience with the skill of a musician upon a familiar instrument. His wit was quite Gallic in its delicacy, and lost nothing in effect by being absolutely free from vulgarity. His English style possessed a full measure of that *curiosa felicitas* which he himself attributed to Lord Lytton. This last trait was all the more remarkable when we remember not only that Mr. Telang spoke in an adopted language, but that he made no attempt to elaborate his speeches beforehand. With his matter thoroughly digested and his line of argument carefully arranged, he, like John Bright, left the appropriate words to come at the time. Taken all round, in manner, matter, and effect, his speeches may, perhaps, be better compared with those of Lord Rosebery than with the public utterances of any other English speaker of the present day."

Short quotations can at the best give but a very imperfect idea of oratory; they can hardly even suggest the sustained simplicity and cogency of Mr. Telang's rhetoric. Yet such of my readers as have never heard him will not regret to find a few extracts to illustrate his wit and satire and his aptness of allusion, both historical and literary. The first is from a speech delivered at a Sheriff's meeting at Bombay, called to protest against the abolition of the import duties on cotton, and explains itself:—

"I cannot sit down without adding to what has fallen from my friend Mr. Naoroji, a word of sympathy with our brethren in Bengal under the rebuke which was administered to them by the Viceroy, in consequence of their action with reference to the subject which we are met to discuss this evening. That rebuke, gentlemen, I venture to say—though I am but a humble individual speaking about the most exalted personage in the Indian Empire—that rebuke was most unmerited, ungenerous, uncharitable, unjust. Gentlemen, we are all pretty familiar with the mastery of English style, that *curiosa felicitas* which characterises Lord Lytton's speeches and writings. But I make bold to say that that mastery of style, that *curiosa felicitas*, was never turned to worse use, was never more mischievously employed, than when it was made the vehicle of that rebuke to the members of the deputation consisting of eminent subjects of Her Majesty in Calcutta. Lord Lytton's reply to the deputation is exceptionable, not merely for its fallacies and incorrect statements, not merely for its spirit and tone, but also because of its being quite unprecedented among

the replies of Her Majesty's representatives to her Indian subjects throughout almost the whole course of British rule. In that reply Lord Lytton said that he was anxious to put an end to a 'fruitless and increasingly irritating controversy.' Gentlemen, that passage of his lordship's reply reminds me very strongly of a passage in another of Lord Lytton's performances—in a capacity in which I at all events can give to his genius the tribute of a much more unalloyed admiration—I mean in his capacity of a poet. In one of his exquisite 'Fables in Song' Lord Lytton describes man as a paradoxical creature, and, after adducing several instances to bear out the view, he winds up thus:—

'Height measures he in depth, seeks peace in strife,
And calls all this the poetry of life.'

His lordship, gentlemen, has undoubtedly sought peace in strife, both in our north-west, where, under the guidance of his chief, Lord Beaconsfield, he has gone in quest of a scientific frontier, and also in this affair of domestic administration. For the problematical 'peace' in the future by the stoppage of an irritating controversy his lordship has resorted to a widespread strife in the present. And probably Lord Lytton has by this time seen that the cinders of that 'controversy' have been blown into a vigorous flame by his own breath."

Our next extract shall be from a speech on the Ilbert Bill, in which he tackles Sir Fitz-James Stephen and his 'gospel of force'.

"His first proposition, not first in order in his letter but first in importance, is that the policy of Lord Ripon's government is shifting the foundations of British power in this country, or, to use his own expression, is inconsistent with the foundations on which British power rests. Now, I deny this entirely. I say that the principles of Lord Ripon's administration, as pointed out in our memorial, are in consonance with the long-established principles of the British Government as laid down by Parliament and the Crown. And I say further, that those principles are in accord with the lessons to be derived from the study of past history. I remember being struck many years ago, in reading the history of the Romans under the Empire, with a passage in which the author said that one great lesson to be deduced from the history of Rome was that all conquering nations, in order to render their government in the conquered countries stable and permanent, must divest themselves of their peculiar privileges by sharing them with the conquered peoples. Now, gentlemen, we all know that it is the proud and just boast of Englishmen that they are the Romans of the modern world, and that the British Empire is in modern days what the Roman Empire was in ancient times. If so, are we wrong, are we unreasonable in asking that the lessons of Roman history, and, as Mr. Merivale points out, the lessons of the history of other ancient governments also, should be adopted by our British rulers? Is it not quite proper and reasonable for us to ask that the countrymen of Clarkson and Wilberforce, of Gladstone and John Bright, should not only adopt those lessons but improve upon them, and rise superior to the countrymen of Marius and Sylla, the Triumvirs and Cæsar? I venture to say, gentlemen, that if Britons are now content to fail to carry out those lessons and to fall short of the generosity of the Romans, it will be regarded as not creditable to them by the future historian. And as a loyal subject of the British Government I should be sorry for such a result."

Having denounced the 'Jingoism' of Lord Lytton, and applauded the 'Liberalism' of Lord Ripon, Mr. Telang would have none of the 'Diplomacy', the tortuous *haute politique*, which Lord Dufferin for its sins imposed on India. No one who was present at Allahábád, when all India was reeking with the 'exuberant verbosity' of the St. Andrew's dinner speech, can forget how the following passage brought down the house, and the pawky way in which the speaker's eye suggested that the fable of the crab might possibly be given a slightly different application.

"His Lordship says: 'The idea authoritatively suggested, as I understand, is the creation of a representative body or bodies, in which the official element shall be in a minority, who shall have what is called the power of the purse, and who through this instrumentality, shall be able to bring the British Executive into subjection to their will.' The basis for that statement is our demand that the financial statement shall be brought before the Council for discussion. Not only do I not find in any of the reports any grounds for such a statement, but I find what is actually the reverse of it. It has been said over and over again that the Executive shall have the power of deciding what shall be done, and of absolutely vetoing any proposal emanating from the rest of the Council, and yet in face of such a resolution as this, which we have passed not once, not twice, but three times, such a statement has been made by his Lordship. I can only express my amazement at it, and I cannot believe his Lordship to have been capable of making it, except on the assumption that he has lacked the time to study our reports himself. The various charges which his Lordship makes against the Congress, are charges which remind me of a certain definition which was once given of a crab, viz., that a crab is a red fish which walks backwards; and the criticism made upon that was that the definition was perfectly correct, except that the crab was not a fish, that it was not red, and that it did not walk backwards. Now I may say that Lord Dufferin's criticism is perfectly correct, except that we have not asked for democratic methods of government; we have not asked for Parliamentary institutions, which England has got after many centuries of discipline; we have not asked for the power of the purse; and we have not asked that the British Executive should be brought under subjection to us."

But it will after all be for his social qualities and domestic virtues that Mr. Telang will be most deeply and permanently missed by that smaller circle that had the privilege of his friendship and acquaintance. In his case the two terms were nearly identical; for he was one of those rare men whom to know was to think of as a friend. True, indeed, no man is indispensable in his day and generation. In political life, in the official sphere, in the busy mart, in club or coterie, the best man drops out, and, if not forgotten, is at least not missed. A new leader, a new colleague, a new servant, carries on the work. But in the inner circle of friendship and the innermost of the family, the void is not so easily filled. The empty chair stands long vacant. And in India Mr. Telang's name was a household word, as the very embodiment of *pietas* in its classic sense. In devotion to parents, wife, and children, he was not outstripped by the *pius Æneas* himself. Indeed—and he would have been the last to wish that in writing his epitaph I should slur over aught—it was this overpowering sentiment that led to what was, in the opinion of many, the one discordant trait in his character. No one saw more clearly than he the need of reform in some of the social customs of the Hindus, no one had advocated it more strenuously; it was then a great shock to many when less than a year ago the once stalwart reformer consented to the marriage of his own daughters at a prematurely early age. Yet for a man of Telang's intellectual temperament it needed perhaps more courage to go back ever so little upon his own career than to refuse the request of a wife sick unto death, and—who shall say—the premonitions of his own early call. Anyhow, he was not a man to make a vicarious sacrifice. Twelve months ago I saw him in his own house in Bombay, when suffering acutely from a painful complaint which there was every hope that a comparatively simple surgical operation would cure completely. Although I knew that one effect of the disease is to produce a strange nervous tension that causes the boldest to dread the simplest remedies, I yet ventured to express my surprise that he, of all

men, should shrink from so easy an ordeal. "Ah!" he said, "if it were only myself, the doctors could do "what they like with me to-morrow. But my old "father"—adopted father, too, remember—"and "mother have the most inveterate objection to the "slightest use of the knife, to the shedding of a "drop of blood; while they live—if I do not go "first—I shall never act against their wishes. "You will probably think me a fool," he added, with his happy smile, "but after all I am a Hindu "of the old stock; and I can no more help "being that than you can help being a Scots-"man." I had long before heard from his own lips that the same cause had prevented him from visiting England; but I hardly expected that education would have made such a capitulation to ignorance. I thought of the many Scots sons who had left their own country in spite of parents' aching hearts, and I thought that in this case at least any Scotsman would read his duty differently—and love his father and mother none the less. Doubtless the problem is a difficult one in domestic ethics, but this concrete example teaches us to judge no man harshly in his solution of it. For me, I hope I may say candidly, it was a revelation. It was my second in India. On the first day I landed in Madras I met a man who in many respects matched, yet in what I may call his domesticity differed *toto cœlo* from, Mr. Telang; I refer to my late friend Sir T. Madhava Rao. And he made a very simple, but to me, there and then, a very striking remark: "Well," he said, "I expect you will find human nature very much "the same in India as all over the world." And so it is; but it crops up differently. The strength of the family love that manifests itself where "seas "between us braid hae roared," can hardly enter into the mental conception of the Hindu. But it is as strong as the love—to many of us *outré* and fantastic—that I fear hurried our friend to an all too early grave. And the lesson is, "Judge not, that ye be not judged."

Well, of Kashinath Trimbak Telang one might write long, but space compels me to say no more. It is to me a mournful satisfaction to be able to say so much in a journal which advocates the cause he had so deeply at heart. "*Festina lente*" was his political motto, but—be sure that every step gained be secured and be in the right direction. Let us, in the east and west of the Empire, who mourn his loss, be animated by his spirit, follow his methods, be guided by his principles, and so best keep his memory green. John Adam.

INDIAN HOARDS OF SILVER.

By Dinsha Edulji Wacha.

The following interesting letter was recently addressed by Mr. D. E. Wacha to the Editor of the *Times of India*:—

In the letter I addressed to you on the 31st July, I expressed my total dissent from the views recently propounded by Mr. O'Conor in the columns of the *Pioneer* on the insignificance of the value of silver in this country in the form of uncoined bullion. I pointed out the insufficiency of the data on which he sought to demonstrate the existence of no more than thirty crores of the metal in that form; and observed that the figures were simply made to suit the new position taken up by the Government of India. Arraigned on all sides that it has by one blow immensely depreciated the value of hoarded bullion, it was obliged to start the new trace, namely, that there was no such colossal hoarding of silver as is popularly believed. To admit "vast hoards" would be tantamount to a confession of the accusation hurled against it by Mr. Schmidt and others. And Mr. O'Conor's statement, from the Government of India's point of view, is, therefore, not unintelligible. It is apparently put forth with the view to enable that Government to escape from the serious dilemma into which it has brought itself by the Amended Coinage Act.

I also pointed out that sweeping as was the hypothesis of Mr. O'Conor, it was not even correct as to facts. For he strangely omitted to consider from his calculation the total amount of silver imported and the total value of rupees coined between 1835 and 1854. When the statistics embraced by that period are taken into account, his thirty crores disappear, and at once put a different complexion on the whole theory propounded by him. I showed that while the imports amounted to 35·44 crores only, the silver coined at the mint equalled 67·92 crores, which clearly demonstrated the fact of the existence of silver bullion in the country, hoarded *prior* to 1835. There is a vast storehouse of literature and statistics on the subject, which those who run may read in those massy tomes of Parliamentary proceedings, known as "East India Affairs, 1830-1833." The Parliamentary Committee who sat in those years to investigate into the political and commercial affairs of the East India Company took abundant evidence, amongst other matters, on the question of remittances to London and the expediency of forwarding silver bullion. Surely if India, according to a certain class of ignorant and misleading writers in the press, had no silver to speak of prior to the third decade of the present century, it is strange, indeed, that in 1821-23 she should have been able to remit to London bullion to the extent of 2½ crores of rupees! This is, however, an undeniable fact which is recorded in evidence by the Parliamentary Committee just referred to above. It is one strong link in the chain of facts which, as I show later on, goes abundantly to prove the existence of the "vast hoards" which are now persistently denied. It may be stated at this stage that the silver question had agitated the minds of the Court of Directors even in the early part of this century, though in an opposite direction. At the time the grievance was not the depreciation, but the appreciation of the rupee. It was fully worth between 27 and 30d. per shilling, which really signified a larger number of sovereigns against a smaller number of rupees. The position at present is entirely reversed. The rupee has turned from the zenith to the nader; but about the time that I am referring to the former was the subject of much warm controversy between the Board of Control and the Court of Directors. Ample evidence exists in the body of the report of the Parliamentary

Committee to verify the statement. Not only are there elaborate minutes on the question. There is the recorded testimony of the experts examined—experts like Mr. Palmer, the then Governor of the Bank of England, of Mr. Holt Mackenzie, the financial expert of the Company in India and a most able revenue officer, of Mr. Nathaniel Rothschild, head of the great banking firm of that name, and others. It might fill column after column of your broad sheet to reproduce extracts on this vexed question from their evidence; though, I am sure, it would prove *even now* most instructive if published—such is their intrinsic value. To those specially curious to acquaint themselves with the currency and practical finance of India during the early part of the nineteenth century, perhaps no literature of an authentic and unimpeachable character would prove more profitable and useful than the evidence alluded to.

Similarly to those who may be entrusted in sifting the correct facts regarding the hoarding of silver in India previous to 1835, the ample materials embodied in the numerous appendices to the report of the same Parliamentary Committee will be found highly useful. Those are really the only fountain sources where all authentic information may be gleaned at first hand. They egregiously err who, having cared not to verify their statements, talk about the non-existence of statistics regarding silver prior to 1835. I say reliable and accurate statistics *do exist* concerning not only the importation of silver into India from foreign countries between 1800 and 1835, but concerning India's foreign trade and the number of trading vessels that used to visit the ports of Calcutta, Madras, Bombay, and Surat. The following extracts from the reports of the Parliamentary Committee will convince even the most sceptic as to the existence of the statistics which are elsewhere robustly denied; Here is what the Committee say:—"Further returns will be found in the appendix, illustrative of the state of trade between Great Britain, India, and China, showing the value of the imports and the exports, and distinguishing the trade of the Company, of other British subjects, and of Foreigners; and showing the number of vessels and amount of tonnage entered inwards. . . . *Separate returns have also been obtained, showing for a series of years the course and results of the Indian trade in bullions.*" It is not clear, sir, from the sentence I have italicised that complete statistics for a series of years exist to show the amount of bullion imported into India prior to 1835? What a rude shock will it give to those ignorant writers who, speaking without the book, allege that no evidence of an authentic character is forthcoming as to the existence of any quantity of silver in India before the third decade of the present century? Are they prepared to discount the report of the Parliamentary Committee? If not, may it, sir, be asked whether there is "a particle of truth" in their own assertion? Indeed, it is amazing the profound ignorance of those who could arrogate to themselves all knowledge in matters of currency. It will be evident to you from the unimpeachable testimony to which I have referred that those who set up to teach economic truths should themselves display crass ignorance who could pin their faith on teachers who themselves require to be taught or corrected? But I need not waste my breath on those who will not learn or care to verify the statements they publicly put forward without the slightest regard to facts.

I now proceed to unfold the statistics themselves as recorded in the report of the Parliamentary Committee. These will show how far I was justified in challenging in my last the erroneous statement of Mr. O'Conor on the subject. I shall also refer, in the sequel, in support of my statement, to the figures lately submitted to Lord Herschell's Committee by Mr. F. Harrison, a former retired Accountant-General to the Government of India. I shall leave it to you and your readers to say how far his estimates of the hoarding of uncoined silver are based on authentic data, and how far they are corroborative of the popular estimates. Suffice to say at this stage, that, perhaps, there is no other Anglo-Indian expert of equal knowledge and experience who, like Mr. Harrison, is in a position to state his facts with authority. He was a witness on the same topic and other cognate matters before the Parliamentary Committee on Indian Finance which sat from 1871 to 1874; and acquitted himself creditably under the close and searching examination of a powerful cross-examiner and master of practical finance as the late Professor Fawcett.

Returning to the statistics, it will be seen on a reference to the abstract of the trade of India given at pages 1472 and 1473 of the appendix to the Report of the Committee of 1830, that between 1811 and 1826, there was a very large import of silver from abroad—from Great Britain, the United States, the Brazils, South America, China and other countries. According to the table the total imports comprised in that period of sixteen years was 19·12 crores of rupees, while the exports was 3·21 crores; thus leaving a balance of 15·91 crores. The gross imports may be classified as follows:

		Crores.
(1.) From Great Britain	(*a*) by the E. I. Co.	1·95
	(*b*) by Merchants	3·90
		5·85
(2.) From Continental Europe by Merchants		3·89
(3.) From North and South America		9·38
	Total	19·12

The net balance of 16 crores remaining in the country bears out my statement that there was a large quantity of silver hoarded in India prior to 1835. Mr. Harrison, however, gives full and complete statistics of the period comprised between 1800 and 1835. In his "Note" on the stock of silver in India (*vide* "Minutes of Evidence, Indian Currency Committee," p. 307) he observes, on a very cautious computation, that the net imports of silver equalled 53·85 crores. It must be so. For how would have the Government of India been otherwise able to coin between 1835 and 1854 as many as 67 crores of rupees, when during the same interval it only imported 35.44 crores worth of bullion. Virtually, as I observed in my last letter, 32·48 crores of silver was drawn upon from accumulations previous to 1835. It now appears from Mr. Harrison's note that they

were drawn from the net imports of 53 crores hoarded between 1800 and 1835.

I now come to the essential point of this letter which is Mr. Harrison's note. I beg, sir, to draw public attention to it, elucidative as it is of this vexed controversy, and useful as it is at this juncture when the apologists of Government in the press robustly deny the existence of "vast hoards" of uncoined silver, pretending that there cannot be more than thirty crores at the best to speak of! It is to be hoped, sir, you will be so good as to publish in one of your early issues the entire note of Mr. Harrison, for it is hardly possible for me to refer to it here except in the briefest manner. The notes, for there are two, are about to be published in the *Economic Journal*. The one is dated 25th May, 1893, and treats of the entire stock in silver from historic times, and the other is dated 27th May, 1893, and treats of the hoardings of the peasant and emigrant coolie classes. He refrains from entering into details which are all given or to be given in the *Economic Journal*, but he sets the grounds on which he bases his conclusions. Broadly speaking, Mr. Harrison asserts that "the silver in India is about "510 crores of rupees[1]"—54·55 million kilogrammes! In his supplementary note of the 27th May, alluded to, he further observes that out of the 510 crores, he calculates about 166½ crores of rupees as in active circulation, while 343½ crores remain to be accounted for. "Of this," says Mr. Harrison, "considerably "less than fifty crores is hoarded in the form of "rupees. *Roughly speaking it may be said that* 300 *crores may be held in India in the form of bullion, obsolete coin and ornaments.*"

I am sure, sir, few will dispute the above cautious estimate which is arrived at after taking everything into consideration, including the plunders of the Afghan and Persian invaders in the last century. Are these 300 crores a fact or fiction? Will those who have been vigorously asserting that India was a country of coppers and cowries before the third decade of the present century either prove their assertion or disprove Mr. Harrison's estimates? If they or Mr. O'Conor will convince the public that the estimates are erroneous, it would indeed be a great advance on the present stage of the question. Instead of the present ignorant or uninformed opinion, we shall have an authoritative opinion, tested by unimpeachable facts, to go upon. There is something remarkably corroborative about Mr. Harrison's estimates which should not be lost sight of. His estimates of the world's production of silver and those of absorption by India approach very near the estimates independently arrived at by Mr. Soetbeer and referred to in my last letter. The former places the whole production at 244·38 millions of kilogrammes and the absorption by India at 61·67 million kilogrammes, or just about one-fourth. Mr. Soetbeer is a little less: meanwhile what a gigantic difference there is between the thirty crores of Mr. O'Conor and the 300 of Mr. Harrison!

[1] World's Production and Stock of Silver in India:

Period.	World's Production according to Soetbeer.	Absorption by India.		Value of Net Imports.
	In millions of killo-grammes.	In millions of killo-grammes.	In millions of ounces.	In lakhs of rupees.
1835 to 1892 ..	93·70	36·65	1,178·54	34,285
1800 to 1835 ..	21·90	5·72	184·18	5,358
1492 to 1800 ..	117·00	16·20	519·00	15,106
Before 1492 ..	11·78	3.10	99·68	2,900
Total ..	244·38	61·67	1,981·40	57,649

SEPARATION OF JUDICIAL AND EXECUTIVE SERVICES IN BENGAL.

By Romesh Chunder Dutt, C.I.E., I.C.S.

My paper on this subject appeared in the August number of India. The paper has been carefully read by many gentlemen interested in questions of Indian administration, and capable of forming a proper judgment on such questions. Their opinions will help the public in forming a correct opinion on this very important subject.

The Right Hon. Sir Richard Garth, Q.C., late Chief Justice of Bengal, has given my views his unqualified support from a judicial point of view. As his remarks have already appeared in the August number of India it is unnecessary for me to do more than quote one or two sentences only.

"So far," he says, "as I am capable myself of forming an opinion upon his scheme, I entirely approve of it. It seems to me the most natural and obvious means of separating the two great divisions of labour, the executive and the judicial. . . . It seems only in accordance with reason that magistrates who are employed upon executive work should be under the chief executive officer of each district, and that those who are employed in judicial work should be under the chief judicial officer."

These remarks are important, as there is no higher authority on judicial questions concerning Bengal than the late Chief Justice of that province.

In the same way there is no Englishman living who can speak with higher authority on executive and administrative questions concerning Bengal than Mr. Reynolds, late Secretary to the Government of Bengal. He passed his official life in that province, and rose from the lowest appointments in the Civil Service of Bengal to one of the highest. He held charge of some of the most extensive and important districts in Bengal, and performed those combined judicial and executive duties which a district officer in Bengal has to perform. He rose to be Secretary to the Bengal Government, and in that capacity presided over the executive administration of the province. His opinion, therefore, has a unique value and importance.

Mr. Reynolds has suggested one modification to my scheme, and subject to that modification has entirely approved of it. I proposed to contrast sub-deputy collectors with the revenue and executive work of Bengal sub-divisions. Mr. Reynolds thinks that in the more important sub-divisions a deputy collector, and not a sub-deputy collector, should be

entrusted with these duties. A suggestion coming from such an authority is entitled to respect, and I accept it in its entirety. Let deputy collectors be employed in the more important sub-divisions to do the revenue and executive work and sub-deputy collectors in the lighter sub-divisions. This modification will require the appointment of twenty or thirty additional deputy collectors, instead of as many sub-deputy collectors, whose appointment I proposed. Thus modified my scheme has Mr. Reynolds' entire support and approval.

My scheme has been read and approved by other gentlemen, who are still in the Civil Service of Bengal. One of them made to me, independently of Mr. Reynolds, the same suggestion which Mr. Reynolds has made. On the whole, therefore, I believe I am justified in stating that my scheme suggests a practicable way of separating the executive and judicial services in Bengal, without materially adding to the cost of administration.

I have purposely refrained from saying anything on the subject of the existing rules of promotion in the Civil Service. Whether these rules will require modification in some respects after the judicial and executive services have been separated is a matter on which the opinion of the Government of Bengal must be final and conclusive. When I joined the Service in 1871 members of the Service were promoted from the rank of joint magistrates to be district officers, and from the rank of district officers to the posts of district judges. It may be considered desirable and necessary to revert to this old rule of promotion after the district officers have been relieved of their judicial duties. It may be also considered desirable to rule that an assistant magistrate will be entitled to rise to the rank and the judicial powers of a joint magistrate only after he has served as assistant for a certain number of years. Such a rule will ensure some degree of experience and local knowledge in judicial officers, and will also prevent frequent reversions from the post of a joint magistrate to that of an assistant. These, however, are matters which can be best considered and decided by the Government of Bengal when the separation of the judicial and executive services has been decided upon. The Bengal Government will find no difficulty in shaping the rules of promotion in the Civil Service according to the exigencies of a just and proper system of administration.

With regard to the details of the administrative arrangements given in my previous paper, no modification except that of Mr. Reynolds has been suggested to me by my friends competent to form a judgment on the subject. I have no doubt that the scheme as modified and supported by the late Secretary to the Government of Bengal will receive the consideration which it deserves from the authorities, both in India and in England. R. C. Dutt.

A Bombay Correspondent writes that a rumour, lately current in India, to the effect that Lord Roberts was to be the new Viceroy, caused widespread dismay among the opponents of the "spread eagle" military policy.

SIR E. ARNOLD AT POONA.

Under the title "The Garden of Repose," Sir Edwin Arnold contributed lately to the *Daily Telegraph* some reminiscences of his life at Poona, where, at the age of twenty-two, he was appointed principal of the Government College Building. After referring to Sir Alexander Grant's work at Bombay, Sir E. Arnold wrote :—"But my own charge was the more interesting, Poona being the centre of the Deccan, and drawing to itself students from all Maharashtra. There were about five hundred at the Vishrambagh, which was a mediæval palace of the Peishwas, the former kings of the country, situated at the heart of the city, in a quarter named Sunwar Peit. It has since perished by fire, but in its time was a picturesque structure, containing three large courts paved with basalt and surrounded by galleries enriched with exquisitely carved teak-wood arches. The class-rooms, lecture-rooms, and audience chamber, or Diwan-Khana, were similarly embellished with beautifully carved pillars and arches, and in the heart of the building a green garden spread, full of palm trees, bananas, papaw, orange and lemon bushes. When all the students were present, about the class-rooms and corridors, in their white dresses and many-coloured turbans, the *coup d'œil* of my college was really charming, and a great deal of serious work went on there, for Hindoos are earnest pupils, and uproar or turmoil are as rare in Indian class-rooms as in a Japanese school or university." On the first of each month two officials from the Treasury went down to the Vishrambagh, bearing on their shoulders large bags full of rupees for the payment of the scholars, native professors, teachers, and European staff of the college. "By ancient custom these coins were shot out in a heap upon the marble pavement and distributed, in the Principal's presence, by his carcoon Ananda to the various recipients; the natives among them always chinked every rupee on the stone before tying it in their girdles. But some would be absent or ill, and in course of time large sums of silver money would naturally collect in the college chest, the accurate amount of which was both difficult and tedious to check. It was my habit to have the chest emptied now and then on to the stones, that we might see all was right, which was invariably the case. Yet, feeling how much blind reliance must be reposed upon Ananda, I sent him off one day to fetch some papers, and in his absence dropped from my own pocket on the shining heap a rupee. When he returned and went over the counting he reported to me, as a most singular circumstance, that there was one rupee too much in the *hisab*, and, without saying a word to him, I felt well justified afterwards in trusting the carcoon."

"Among my native teachers," continues Sir E. Arnold, "were some very capable men like Krishna Shastri Chiploonkur, and Kero Punt, with minds as large as could be found in Oxford or Cambridge. Among my students, too, were brilliant young men who might have distinguished themselves in the front rank at our universities. I especially recall three Parsee brothers, the Pudumjis, all of whom—Dhorabji, Sorabji, and Nowroji—have since become

leading men in the Presidency. There was also my own especial favourite among the Brahmans, Baba Gokhlé, who died too young for his great capacities to bear full fruit. In conducting the studies of such pupils I learned more than I could teach, and I think of them still with an endless affection and regard."

Sometimes there came anxious seasons when cholera raged in the city, and the streets were blocked with mourners and the dead. "Our own quarter suffered severely on one occasion, and my classes were almost decimated. The Hindu students came to me at last in a body, and asked permission to go all together to the shrine of the goddess of that particular disease—to make propitiatory offerings. I had on the college staff a worthy Scotch professor, who regarded the proposal as shockingly heathenish, and wished me to refuse; but knowing the value of mental impressions at such a time I compromised between science and orthodoxy, and said that if they would all give me their word to boil every drop of water before they drank any, and to take every morning five drops of hydro-chloric acid in their drink I would not only consent, but give them twenty rupees towards the expenses of the pilgrimage. It is notable that the cholera disappeared shortly after the pilgrimage—but privately I never believed this was due to the goddess."

When the work of Government was transferred from the East India Company to the Queen it struck the staff of the Vishrambagh that they ought to do something conspicuously loyal to celebrate the occasion. Sir E. Arnold volunteered to "provide a special feature." Accordingly, taking the largest table-cloth in his bungalow—it was a damask spotted with roses—he stretched it tight upon the matting and reproduced upon it in transparent colours an effigy of the Queen. Finished and dry, the work of art was taken down to the Garden of Repose, stretched upon a screen of bamboe, and set before a large number of oil lamps. Sir E. Arnold says: "That night, after dinner, I had an artist's desire to see how the improvised picture looked in its new position, and, mounting my horse, I rode into the city, which was very gay with illuminations and holiday crowds. On coming near the Vishrambagh the throng of people thickened so much about the approaches that my horse could make no way. I rode round, therefore, to the street of the coppersmiths, but here, also, the squares and lanes were blocked with townspeople all apparently trying to get to the college. I asked what they were so anxious to see, and twenty voices answered, 'Taswir! taswir! It is a picture of the Maharani in the Sunwar-Peit.' When the spot was reached at last my gaze fell upon a spectacle which, for the moment, might have made a Rubens proud, a Raphael vainglorious. Her Majesty, upon my table-cloth, shone gloriously forth in such magnificence of hues—I will say nothing of design or draughtmanship—that a stained-glass window in a cathedral with the sun shining through would be quiet in comparison. The good folks had never beheld any such presentation before. They forgave, in an ecstasy of popular pleasure, the defects they did not perceive; and for many hours there were constant shouts of 'Taswir—taswir!' among the crowds flocking to the spot, and a perpetual stream of them flowing past the gates of the college and crying, 'Wah, wah! Shabash!' and 'Maharani ki jai.' If I could have been guilty of artistic vanity, the cup of popular favour was filled for me as a painter that night."

THE OPIUM COMMISSION.

SUMMARY OF THE EVIDENCE.

(*Concluded from page* 000.)

September 15th.

Sir Thomas Wade said he had resided in China for forty years, during the latter part of the time as British Minister at Pekin. He thought there was no doubt whatever that opium, when used in moderation, was no more harmful than was beer in this country when used in moderation. History proved conclusively that the Chinese had known the drug for centuries, and long before Indian opium was taken into the country by English traders. Even thirty or forty years ago the supply of Indian opium was not sufficient to supply two per cent. of the population which we were accused of demoralising and destroying. The native opium was at that time being extensively grown in four or five provinces. In 1847, when he set to work to study the subject in China, he found that the poppy was cultivated in no less than ten provinces. Previous to 1842 English traders had no access to any part of China except through the one port of Canton, while at that very time the area where opium was most cultivated and most used was in the extreme north-west provinces, 3,000 miles distant from Canton. At that time, too, the native article was taxed in the ordinary way along with other articles of commerce, and it was thus recognised as an ordinary article of commerce by the Government.

Lord Brassey: In the various negotiations that took place since the end of the last war, would you say that it was not the object of the British Government at any time to force the Chinese to receive Indian opium?

Witness: Quite the reverse. So far from there being any reason for saying that in the treatment of the opium question we sought to make China favour the Indian article, it was the fact that on every occasion when the opium question was considered the British Government were anxious to agree to the Chinese proposals to increase the duty. Witness, continuing, expressed his utter astonishment that intelligent men could be found to assert that opium had been forced upon China by British bayonets, and that at length China, overborne by British military force, had been obliged to sanction the cultivation of the drug in China in her own defence. As a matter of fact at the present time there was nothing in our arrangements or treaties with China which would prevent the Chinese Government from imposing higher duties on Indian opium, or from dealing with the import of that article by entire prohibition, or in any other way in which they thought fit. But he did not for a moment imagine that China would ever desire to stop the import,

because the duties they charged upon Indian opium formed so valuable a source of revenue.

Mr. A. Pease read an extract from a speech of Mr. Gladstone at the time of the first Chinese war, in which he denounced the war as one undertaken for the protection of an infamous contraband traffic, and asked the witness whether that was not a contemporary opinion that the war was a war for opium. The witness said he should like to know what knowledge Mr. Gladstone had of the prior events. He thought that Mr. Gladstone was speaking without any accurate knowledge of the facts.

Mr. S. Lockhart, Registrar-General of Hong Kong, expressed his belief that the moderate use of opium was hot harmful, either physically or mentally. In the case of excess the smoker was to some extent injured physically, but not mentally. He certainly did not think that opium-smoking among the Chinese people was as injurious or as great a nuisance as alcohol-drinking in this country.

By Mr. A. Pease: Opium houses in Hong Kong were all licensed; the number was not excessive. He did not believe that it was of necessity the case that the habit grew upon one who indulged in it; on the contrary he had known many cases where the amount consumed was less as time went on.

Dr. Rowell, for twenty-five years a Government medical officer in the Straits Settlement, said that there was a population of 160,000 of Chinese and Malays, principally Chinese. Among these were opium smokers, but he did not think the habit was general. The only occasion when he had particularly observed the opium smokers was when they came into the hospitals. Probably forty per cent. of the admissions were opium smokers. They did not come to the hospital on account of the habit, but to be treated for other diseases.

Mr. A. Langman, a missionary, who had resided eight years in the province of Cheh Kiang, China, stated that all he had heard from the previous missionary witnesses as to the evil effects of opium on the people of China was perfectly true, and was not at all exaggerated. Within the last three weeks he had received a petition from Chinese Christians in the province where he had worked in which they said that it was hardly possible to conceive the extent of the evil caused by opium-smoking. Homes were scattered, wives and families deserted, and all crimes, adultery, robbery, etc., were committed as the result of that habit.

Sir Lepel Griffin, who had been many years in the service of the Indian Government in the Punjab and Central India, and had given a good deal of attention to the subject of opium, having been head of the Opium Revenue department of the Native States, said that the cultivation of opium used to be a Government monopoly, but that was given up long ago, and now the Government had no direct concern whatever in the cultivation or the manufacture of the drug. The system was now entirely one of passing the opium from the States where it was produced and levying the tax upon it. With regard to the proposal to prohibit the cultivation of opium he supposed anything was possible for an autocratic Government, but such an act would be the most tyrannous and unjust proceeding ever adopted by a civilised Government, and would be a direct violation of the whole policy of the Indian Government for the last fifty years. The people of India were not to any great extent consumers of opium except in the case of the Sikhs and the Rajpoots. It was too expensive a habit for the working classes. He did not believe that crime was produced by the use of opium. At all events he had never known such a case in all his experience as a magistrate or judge.

September 16th.

The Secretary of the Commission (Sir Charles Bernard) read communications from Sir Joseph Fayrer and Sir Hugh Low, who were unable to attend personally.

Sir Joseph Fayrer said that he was a surgeon and physician, and had had thirty years' practice and experience in various parts of India. It was unfortunate that human nature was so constituted that it would not forego the use of stimulants and narcotics, all of which were liable to be abused, and when they were so abused they produced the most degrading and pernicious effects upon the human race. There could not be a doubt that in the great cities of India, China, and other Eastern countries, the abuse was carried by a certain but limited number to a great excess, but to nothing like the extent to which the abuse of alcohol was carried in this country.

Sir Hugh Low, who was for many years employed as Administrator of Perak and other States of the Malay Peninsula under the British Government, wrote that he was of the decided opinion that there was no such abuse of opium in Perak and in the colony of Labuan in Borneo, or any of the islands near the Straits, as had been described by the Chinese missionaries.

Mr. William Lockhart, a medical missionary in China from 1838 to 1864, during the latter part of which period he had half-a-dozen hospitals under his charge, said he had had a large experience of the effects of opium in China. When taken in small quantities the drug was not particularly harmful, but he found that the invariable tendency with confirmed opium users was to gradually increase the dose. When a man became in this way a victim to the opium habit, it was undoubtedly pernicious and injurious to him in every respect; his mental faculties were not particularly impaired, but his general system became deteriorated in every way. This was so completely recognised in China that persons who were given up to the habit of opium smoking were not allowed to give evidence in any legal proceedings in the Chinese courts, as they were not considered as able to keep themselves from corruption. He did not think it possible to prevent the cultivation of opium in India, but he agreed that it was very undesirable that the English Government or the Indian Government should engage in such a trade as the opium trade, and he had a very strong

opinion that the Indian Government ought to free itself from all share and complicity in the trade.

Dr. GEORGE DODS, who had resided for many years in Canton and had practised as a medical man there, said that his experience was that most of the opium-smokers used the drug in moderation and without any serious harm.

Mr. D. M'LAREN, formerly president of the Edinburgh Chamber of Commerce, said that the trade between India and China had always been of an anomalous kind, being dominated by this question of opium. It was almost impossible to resist the conclusion from figures that the opium trade from India to China had the effect of checking the demand for British manufactures in China. If we ceased to send so much opium to China, China would take more of English manufactures.

Lord BRASSEY: You mean that if the Chinese spend their money on opium they can't afford to buy British manufactures also?—Witness: That is exactly what I am endeavouring to show.

Sir JAMES LYALL: Then your case is simply that England ought to have the profit that India has now; that you would destroy the Indian opium industry merely to put larger trade and greater profits in the hands of English manufacturers?—Witness: I certainly think that it would be better for China if she took more British manufactured goods and less opium.

Sir JAMES LYALL. Is not the explanation of the slow growth of the Chinese demand for British manufactures due to the conservative character of the Chinese people in the matter of dress, etc. compared with the Japanese?—Witness: I do not know that that is the case. The comparatively small demand for British goods in China is attributed by the native merchants themselves to the opium traffic.

The Rev. T. J. SELBY, a Wesleyan minister who had spent many years in China, said that he had carefully gone over the evidence that had already been given by the missionaries as to evils inflicted upon the Chinese people by the use of opium, and he agreed with the statements that had been made.

Deputy Surgeon General PARTRIDGE, of the Bombay Army, who had served in India from 1855 to 1885, said that every year India sent to China a sufficient quantity of this poisonous drug to kill 19,600,000,000 people.

Sir WILLIAM ROBERTS: Are you aware that an analogous calculation with respect to the export of salt to India would yield about the same result?—Witness said he had not gone into the question as to salt; but it was the fact that we were sending to China this enormous quantity of poison every year.

Mr. MICHIE, a merchant who had resided in various parts of China for forty years, said that he saw very few cases indeed of the excessive use of opium. He denied emphatically that he had ever found Chinamen professing hatred to Englishmen on account of the opium traffic.

This concluded the evidence to be taken in England. The Commission will reassemble in Calcutta on November 15th.

Reviews.

THE EARLY DAYS OF THE EAST INDIA COMPANY.

The Register of Letters, etc., of the Governor and Company of Merchants of London trading into the East Indies, 1600-1619. Edited by Sir GEORGE BIRDWOOD, M.D., K.C.I.E., assisted by WILLIAM FOSTER, B.A. (London: Bernard Quaritch. Price 42s.)

IF we may judge from recent publications on the subject, considerable interest has been aroused in the story of the origin of the East India Company. It is natural that it should be so. As English people feel more deeply the responsibility imposed upon them by their position in India they will become more anxious to understand how their Empire in the East was founded. The East India Company was extinguished amid general approbation after the Mutiny. It was considered that its work was done, and that it was time for the English people to assume the direct government of India. The abolition of the Company was only regretted by certain of its servants, and the nation, as a whole, considered that the Mutiny proved the power of the Company to be unjustifiable, and its administration incompetent. No words were too harsh for the fallen power, and it was ushered out of existence amidst the loudly expressed contempt of the popular press. But now that five and thirty years have passed during which India has been governed directly by the Crown, it is beginning to be seen that the government of the Company had its advantages, and that the condition of the people of India has not improved so greatly as was expected under the new *régime*. The Company had its faults, no doubt, but it had also its peculiar merits which were not perceived at the time of its abolition. There is much modern testimony that the people of India desiderate the old order of things, and look back to the sympathetic administration of the Company's servants with real affection. The prolongation of the existence of the Company into the present century made it, of course, an anachronism, but its efficiency in former days has now invested it with historical interest since its political power has passed away.

It is a pity that an exhaustive comparison has never been made between the history and administration of the European trading companies which opened up direct commerce between Europe and Asia after the overthrow of the Portuguese monopoly. The only work with which we are acquainted that deals with this subject is *Les Grandes Compagnies de Commerce*, by M. Pierre Bonnassieux, published in Paris last year. This work is, as far as it goes, of considerable value, but it shows clearly how much yet remains to be done before an exhaustive book can be written on the subject. There are innumerable documents in the archives in London, Paris, Amsterdam and Stockholm, dealing with the history of the great English, French, Dutch and Swedish companies. There must be documents in existence

also at Copenhagen, Berlin and Vienna, which would throw light on the origin and progress of the Danish, Prussian and Austrian companies. It may fairly be expected that in the present condition of historical science investigators will be found to make use of these various documents, and thus illustrate the growth of the commerce of the East with Europe. Hitherto, as M. Bonnassieux' book shows, but little has been done, and until progress is made in this direction full light cannot be thrown on the greatest commercial company the world has ever seen, the Company of Merchants of London trading into the East Indies. It is not enough for us to know from our own records alone how the Company grew and prospered. We must also know how its transactions presented themselves to other European residents in the East.

Hitherto England has done more than other countries to investigate the records of the early careers of its citizens in Asia. This is but natural, for like Aaron's rod its company has swallowed up all the others in India. The chief publications hitherto have been Mr. Noel Sainsbury's volumes in the "Calendars of State Papers," which include the "Court Minutes" and "Original Correspondence" of the first East India Company; "The "Dawn of British Trade to the East Indies, 1599–1603," edited by Mr. Henry Stevens in 1886; and Sir George Birdwood's "Report on the Old Records "of the India Office." There are also many invaluable documents embodied in various volumes published by the Hakluyt Society, such as Markham's edition of "Lancaster's Voyages" and Corney's "Voyage of Sir Henry Middleton." To these publications Sir George Birdwood and Mr. Quaritch have supplied a useful supplement in the volume now under review. This work contains the first Letter Book of the London East India Company extending from 1600 to 1619. It was not handed over to Mr. Sainsbury when he commenced his "Calendar" and was overlooked by Sir George Birdwood in his "Report." It was only discovered by Mr. F. C. Danvers, the Superintendent of Records at the India Office after he took over that appointment in 1884. According to Sir George Birdwood it was probably commenced in the latter half of 1606, for the handwriting shows that the earlier documents were entered up all at once, probably from the original drafts, but it was afterwards kept up from day to day. It is this contemporaneous character which gives the collection its greatest value and makes it one of the most important authorities for the period of which it treats.

It is difficult to review such a volume as this in a few pages, and it will probably be of more interest to write down a few reflections suggested by careful study of it than to give a summary of its contents or a long series of quotations. The first thought that occurs is that the founders of the East India Company were far more anxious to establish a trade in peppers and spices than in purely Indian commodities. The perpetual cry of the first Directors, or "Committees" as they were then called, is for pepper, nutmegs, cloves, cinnamon, mace, and other spices. They set far more store by their trade with the spice islands than by their trade with India itself. It is well enough known that it was mainly owing to the expulsion of the English factors from the spice islands that the attention of the Company was concentrated upon India. This fact comes out clearly in the first "Letter Book" of the Company. Banda, Bantam, Ternartes, Tidore, and Macassar fill a larger place in these letters than Surat; spices a larger place than dyes, or muslins, or brocades. It would be a curious speculation to consider whether, if the Company had ousted the Dutch from the spice islands, the Indian Empire would ever have existed? It was not until some years after the massacre at Amboyna in 1623 that the London merchants gave up their strife with the Dutch for the trade of the spice islands, and made India the centre of their enterprise. It may fairly be assumed that, if the English and not the Dutch had won the control of the trade of the Further East, the Indian Empire might have fallen to some other European nation. If this had been the case a Dutch or a French Indian Empire would have borne a very different character from the existing administration, and the capital of the English in Asia would have been in Sumatra or Java instead of on the banks of the Ganges. The crisis in the struggle between the English and the Dutch in the Further East did not arrive till after the period covered in the first "Letter Book" and we read in the instructions, or "remembrance" as it is called, given by Sir Henry Middleton to the factors left at Bantam in 1605: "My desire is that "you endeuo^r yor selues to hold friendshipp wth the "Hellenders & suffer noe euill speeches to passe "by them by anie of ovr people & although the "meaner sorte of them be rude I finde that their "Commaunders be desirovs to lyue in amitie & loue "wth vs" (p. 93). Sir George Birdwood illustrates this attitude by a quotation from Edmond Scot, one of the first factors at Bantam: "It is true," says Scot, "that though we [the Dutch and the English "factors at Bantam] were mortall enemies in our "Trade yet in all other matters we were friends and "would have lived and dyed one for the other." Yet less than twenty years after these words were written a cruel massacre occurred, in which Gabriel Towerson and nine other English servants of the Company were tortured to death by the Dutch. Another reflection suggested by these Letters is the unfeigned piety of the first directors and their affectionate care for their servants. In the instructions issued at the dispatch of every fleet orders are given that morning and evening prayers should be offered up on each of the Company's ships, and it appears (p. 370) that it was the purser's duty to conduct the service, for it is stated in one of the instructions that there had been delivered unto the purser for that purpose "a faire "Bible, wth the booke of Comon prayers." Command is also given that the captains of the ships are to forbid blaspheming, swearing, and above all dicing, for it is asserted that the practice of playing dice leads to quarrels and murders, and often to the mariners wagering and losing the whole of their pay, and thus being left in distress. Equally explicit are the directions given to the factors left in Asia regularly to hold divine service, and to beware of quarrelling among themselves. In a curious passage in the instructions for the voyage, in 1611,

the directors say that they have sent out certain books for the use of their servants in the East. The choice of literature is somewhat odd:—"Item for "the better comforte & recreation of such of o[r] "ffactors as are recideinge in the Indies. Wee have "sent the works of that worthie servant of Christe, "Mr. Wm. Perkins, to enstruct their myndes & feede "their souls wth thatt heauenlie foode of the know- "ledge of the trueth of Gods word, & the booke of "Martirs in twoe voleumes, as alsoe Mr. Hackluits "Voyadgs to recreate their spiritts wth varietie of "historie: w[ch] bookes wee desier to haue lefte "wth m[r] Lawrence ffemell o[r] cheefe Agent or some "other o[r] cheefe ffactor in those partes where "most of o[r] people shall be resident to remaine "there for the Comforte & vses before mentioned, "where wee requier that they should have espetiall "care to sanctifie the Sabboth daye, & to reade "vpon those devyne books for the instruccon and "comforte of all those that shall be there remayn- "inge" (p. 419). Nor was it only for the minds and souls of their servants that the company had care. Elaborate directions are given for keeping their ships scrupulously clean. As early as 1605 lemon-water is ordered to be taken as a remedy against the scurvy (p. 100); water-casks are to be kept from growing musty; and when the men land at any place they are to keep together, in order to avoid the attacks of the natives. When their servants fall upon evil days, as in the case of Anthony Marlow and Francis Bucke, who were taken prisoners by the Portuguese at Surat and imprisoned at Lisbon, every effort is made to secure their comfort and release. The very form in which the letters from London to the factors in the East are concluded shows the attitude of the directors to their distant agents, for they sign themselves "Your loving friends," a familiar and affectionate phrase, which, according to Sir George Birdwood, was used up to the termination of the Company's rule in India.

Much information is to be found in this letter-book as to the relations between the Company and the Crown, and the full text is given of the letters written by James I. to Eastern potentates, as well as the Royal Commissions giving to the Company's captains power to administer martial law. Occasionally we find mention of the chief ministers of the time. Of these the most important is Robert Cecil, first Earl of Salisbury, who was Secretary of State at the beginning of the reign of James I. The directors of the Company tried to please the powerful minister through his taste for natural history. Thus in the instructions for the third voyage in 1607 we find: "Item: Remember to doe yo[r] best to bringe for the "Lorde of Salisburie some Parratts, Mounckeys, "Marmesatts, or other straundge beasts & fowles "that you esteeme rare & delightfull" (p. 130). This request is several times repeated in subsequent instructions. It should be noticed that the earliest known copy of the first charter of Queen Elizabeth to the London Company is here reprinted (pp. 163—189) and carefully collated with the other known copies. The original has never yet been found. Finally, we cannot quit this delightful volume without expressing our gratitude to Sir George Birdwood for the introduction and the notes with which he has enriched his work. All who are in any way interested in Indian affairs are acquainted with the exceptional knowledge possessed by Sir George Birdwood. His introduction, somewhat discursive though it be, we would not have by a single page shorter. His remarks on trade as the precursor of Empire are illustrated with telling examples. His notes on the commercial products of the East impart fully the knowledge which he alone possesses. Nor must Mr. Quaritch be left without his meed of praise. He it was who suggested the publication of this volume, and if he would earn our gratitude further he would persuade Sir George Birdwood to follow it up with another. Let us hope that length of days may be given to Sir George to carry out an intention he once had of editing the Court Books of the old East India Company. He says in his preface: "After sixty every year adds rapidly to one's incapacity for the incessant labour of minute verification required for the proper discharge of so burdensome a duty. But Sir George Birdwood might reflect that few men younger than sixty have accumulated the ripe knowledge necessary to the illustration of a great work of reference and research.

CONTEMPORARY INDIAN HISTORY.

Indian History of our own Times—1859-1888. By Satya Chandra Mukerji, M.A., B.L., Vakil, High Court, N.-W. Provinces. (Calcutta: S. K. Lahiri and Co., 54 College Street. Price, Rs. 5.)

The success of Mr. Justin McCarthy's "History of our own Times," and similar publications, has induced Mr. Satya Chandra Mukerji, a distinguished young graduate of the Calcutta University, to undertake a work of the same description for India. Mr. Mukerji is well qualified for his task. He is a son of Babu Shital Chandra Mukerji of Muttra, and during his university career won the gold medal in history and the Cobden medal in political economy at the M.A. examination. He then proceeded to Alláhábad, where he has since practised as a vakil before the High Court of the North-Western Provinces. He has, therefore, by birth and by training, an exceptional knowledge of the contemporary history of Bengal and the North-Western Provinces. With regard to other parts of India he has been permitted to consult the Government archives, and has been a diligent student of contemporary literature, and especially of the newspaper press. He is no novice in the compilation of history, for his "Travellers' "Guide to Agra," which was noticed in the August number of India, proved that he was accustomed to deal with historical documents.

It is with peculiar pleasure that we notice that some graduates of the Indian universities are at last turning their attention to history. Hitherto it has always seemed one of the most curious features of the annual return of Indian publications that so few of them have been historical. Continuous activity is shown in poetry and fiction, and even, in a less degree, in biography; but history has been almost

entirely neglected. This is a characteristic of Hindu literature from the earliest times. It would be difficult to draw up a list of Indian writers who have built up a reputation as historians. Ferishta and the distinguished authors who have dwelt on the glories of the Muhammadan courts and Muhammadan dynasties were not of Indian origin, and wrote in Persian. Among the modern school, who have been educated after the European fashion, it would be difficult to mention any original historical writers, except the late Raja Rajendralala Mitra, the late Mr. Justice Telang, and Mr. Romesh Chunder Dutt, while successful poets, novelists and journalists might be cited by the dozen. It is to be apprehended that modern educated Indians are devoting themselves so much to journalism that they are in risk of forgetting that one of the foundations of sound journalism is a thorough historical training. The Indian press of to-day shows plenty of vigour and vitality. It fearlessly attacks abuses; it is skilled in criticising Government measures; it shows no mean grasp of the great ends of politics, and subtly seizes the vulnerable points in the policy it condemns; but it is not always remarkable for historical knowledge. The weakest side of Indian journalism is to be seen in the vague and often incorrect references to the past. The writers feel that they ought to be able to appeal to the past history of their country to support their contentions, but they have not the knowledge to enable them to do so. Mr. Mukerji's volume will be invaluable therefore to Indian journalists. But it is not planned to be a mere handbook for their use. It has a more ambitious aim, and is intended to give a fair working knowledge of contemporary Indian history to Indian readers of all classes. Contemporary history tends to become glorified journalism. Mr. Mukerji has not quite escaped this danger. But he has honestly striven to judge as a historian, and to narrate his story with some grasp of true historical proportion.

The "Indian History of our own Times" is, so to speak, a cross between the well known work of Mr. Justin M'Carthy and the jejune but useful "Annals of our Time" of Mr. Joseph Irving. Each year is treated separately, but its events are classified and not arranged month by month. India is rightly treated as a whole and not province by province, though, as might be expected, more attention is paid to Bengal and the North-Western Provinces than to Madras or Burma. Paragraphs are given to the various important political measures and striking historical events during the year, and are succeeded by a short summary of administrative changes and minor facts under the heading of General Events. It is exceedingly interesting to observe the attitude of an Indian thinker like Mr. Mukerji to the progress of his country. He lays weight upon many things that the English historian ignores, and passes over with a few words some points upon which English historians enlarge. He gives an elaborate account of each meeting of the Indian National Congress, and his sympathy with their aims colours the latter pages of his book.

It is peculiarly interesting to observe Mr. Mukerji's opinion of modern English officials, for they seldom coincide with the received English judgment. There are however a few notable exceptions. He describes Sir Alfred Lyall as "an accomplished man of letters "with intimate knowledge of many important "departments of the State, who came as a distinct "improvement on his predecessor." He speaks of "the literary abilities, the varied capacity, and the "broad-hearted statesmanship" of Sir Charles Aitchison, and of "the solid and useful work" done by Sir John Morris during his Chief Commissionership of the Central Provinces. On the other hand, he cordially denounces Sir George Campbell. He declares that Sir Rivers Thompson was a most unpopular ruler, and that Mr. Whitley Stokes "though a great lawyer and a sound jurist "lacked the practical talents of statesmanship, and "gave the country many measures which did no "good." He is even more outspoken about Sir Mountstuart Grant-Duff, who, he says, "proved a "failure in the administration of the Madras "Presidency; he retained his usual flippancy, and, "though he wrote and talked much, did very little "solid work." Mr. Mukerji passes judgment on the different Viceroys with great deliberation. The only one to whom he seems—to English ideas—to be unfair is Lord Lawrence. To the others he refers in words which will be generally acknowledged as correct. But Lord Ripon is the god of his adoration: "The noble policy of Lord Ripon," he says, "and his noble utterances enthroned him in "the eternal gratitude of the Indian people, and "though the actual and net results his lordship "could accomplish were but little, his Indian "subjects clearly recognised the efforts that he had "made on their behalf, the great difficulties in his "way, and they did not hesitate to accord to him "the highest honours. History will recognise in "him a ruler of the highest conscientiousness and of "the noblest aims, though he lacked the practical "turn of mind to reconcile conflicting interests. A "friend to all that was high and noble he made "the people of India feel that they ought really "to be ruled in their highest interest and in the "spirit of those pledges which their gracious "Sovereign had given to them on a memorable "occasion."

It is only fair to state that Mr. Mukerji's writing of English is extremely good, and that he is in no way to be confounded with the famous author of the "Memoir of Mr. Justice Onoocool Chunder "Mookerjee," whose curious English has given delight to all his readers. Mr. Satya Chandra Mukerji does not attempt to rival the remark "when a boy he was filamentous, but gradually in "the course of time he became plump as a "partridge," nor does he mix up modern slang with French quotations and newly invented English words. On the contrary he writes with remarkable clearness and sometimes with elegance. The worst mistake we have noticed is that in discussing the Baroda poisoning case, he speaks of Sir Arthur Phayre as the Baroda resident, having seemingly confused the celebrated Chief Commissioner of Burmah with his brother, Sir Robert Phayre. There are a few minor misprints in proper names such as Whiteley Stokes for Whitley Stokes, Sir Lewis

Pelley for Sir Lewis Pelly, de Lavalaya for de Laveleye, Sir Rivers Thomson for Sir Rivers Thompson, and others, but on the whole the book is very correctly printed. It is to be hoped that Mr. Mukerji will see his way to adding an index to the second edition which is certain to be called for.

CAMPBELL'S MEMOIRS.

Memoirs of my Indian Career. By Sir GEORGE CAMPBELL, M.P., K.C.S.I., D.C.L. Edited by Sir Charles E. Bernard, K.C.S.I. 2 vols. (London: Macmillan and Co. Price 21s.)

[SECOND NOTICE.]

BY far the most important part of Sir George Campbell's Indian career was his tenure of Lieutenant-Governorship of Bengal from 1871 to 1874. It was during this period that he had the opportunity of showing his qualities as a great reformer and administrator. During the early years of his service in India he had held subordinate positions. In Oudh he had not felt in harmony with Lord Canning's post-mutiny policy, and had been in opposition to his official superiors. As a judge of the Calcutta High Court he had been divorced from the executive department, and he had only acted as Chief Commissioner of the Central Provinces for a few months in 1867-68. It was his rule in Bengal which first gave him the opportunity of showing his administrative powers, and it is upon this portion of his career that his reputation must rest.

The appointment of Campbell to the Lieutenant-Governorship of Bengal was in itself a noteworthy act. He was the only man who ruled the most populous province in India without ever having held a post in any secretariat, either in a provincial or in the supreme Government. He had been prevented by the outbreak of the mutiny from taking up the office of Secretary to the Government of the North-West Provinces, and he had never before or after that date been engaged in the head-quarters of Government activity. This fact makes Campbell's appointment unique in the history of Bengal, and his freedom from official prejudices is probably due to it. It is commonly alleged that, unless the Supreme Government reserved the Lieutenant-Governorships and Chief-Commissionerships for men who had done good service in the Government of India, it would be difficult to get the picked men of the Civil Service to undertake the arduous work of Secretaries to Government. On the other hand the traditions of the secretariat are not suited for forming good Lieutenant-Governors. And there can be no doubt that Campbell's success as an administrator was largely due to the fact that his originality had not been checked by the narrowing influences of constant desk work. It is worth noting that Sir George Campbell, like the present Lieutenant-Governor, Sir Charles Elliott, was a North-West civilian, and that both of them started with a preconceived idea that the principles of administration in Bengal were much inferior to those prevailing in the North-West Provinces. Yet, Sir George Campbell was a reforming Lieutenant-Governor, while Sir Charles Elliott was exactly the contrary. The attitude of the two men and their types of mind are, of course, completely different, but the fact that Campbell never served in the Government of India may possibly account to some extent for his superiority over Elliott. The nature of Campbell's appointment was curious. He had returned to England in 1868 after six months' work in the Central Provinces, and had intended to enter English political life by obtaining a seat in the House of Commons. In this ambition he was disappointed, and the time was approaching when it would become necessary for him to retire from the Civil Service if he did not return to India. At this critical moment the Duke of Argyll, then Secretary of State for India, offered him the government of Bengal in the autumn of 1870. Though he would have preferred the government of the Punjab Campbell at once accepted the post so unexpectedly offered him. In his own words "there was the question of large "reforms in the Bengal system which had been so "long delayed, and on the approach of Sir W. "Grey's retirement, Lord Mayo (very much I think "at Strachey's suggestion), thought of me as the "President of the Famine Commission, author "of the most important parts of the Report, and "well-known to be a strong reformer." (Vol. ii. p. 197.)

It was therefore on account of his reforming and liberal tendencies that Campbell was sent to Bengal, and he justified the expectations which had been formed of him. His predecessor, Sir W. Grey, was essentially conservative, and strongly opposed to tenant-right and radical reforms. Lord Mayo was, on the contrary, a born reformer, and in the largest province of India needed a reforming colleague. Campbell hits off the Viceroy's character in a few words. "Though Lord Mayo was nominally a Con- "servative, I never met a man who was by nature a "more genuine Radical—a quality evinced by his "sympathy for the masses and his boldness in "active government and reforms." (Vol. ii. p. 205.) With such a Viceroy Sir George Campbell's Government opened well. He first passed the Road Cess Act, which initiated local taxation in Bengal, and proposed an Education Cess, which was unfortunately postponed. A great outcry was made that this local taxation would be unpopular, and that it would be difficult to raise cesses. It was asserted that the Permanent Settlement was being infringed, and that the new system was revolutionary. It was, however, carried into effect and proved successful. Sir George Campbell, in his "Memoirs," seems specially proud of this triumphant result of his first reform which was productive of much local benefit. Even more beneficial was Campbell's great educational reform. He perceived that, although much money was spent on higher education, practically nothing was done for primary or elementary education. There was not the means, even if his Education Cess had not been vetoed by Lord Northbrook, to provide an elaborate system of primary education. Campbell therefore, wisely enough, applied himself to making the native vernacular schools more

efficient. These schools, conducted by native teachers, studded the province, and Campbell's measures were intended to render them more efficient by official encouragement, regular inspection, and small grants of money. In this way primary education was placed on a regular footing in Bengal, and full justice was paid to Campbell's reforms by the great Education Commission which sat in 1881–82. These two measures were the most notable reforms of Sir George Campbell in Bengal. Administratively he showed his vigour in every department. He endeavoured to check the constant removal of Civil officers from one district to another. He tried to put a stop to the legal employment of forced labour in the tea-gardens of Assam. He took measures for the improvement of agriculture. He encouraged public works, especially local works, as opposed to large and ambitious schemes. He sympathised with the highly educated Bengali literary class, and acted as President of the Bengal Social Science Association. He made the arrangements for the first census of Bengal in 1871. He encouraged the collection of statistics, knowing the importance of correct information in appraising the duties of government. He made a thorough inquiry into the state of the gaols and appointed an officer of judicial experience as Inspector-General. He enlarged the hospital in Calcutta, which bears his name, and most important of all he insisted on preserving the independence of the District officers from the constant encroachments of the great Departments. This is but a rapid summary of the chief features of Sir George Campbell's three years' government of Bengal, and it is more than enough to stamp him as one of the ablest Anglo-Indian officials. The one great strain of his administration was the Bengal famine of 1873–74, and he had the advantage of being assisted in the labour of coping with it by his destined successor, Sir Richard Temple. Unfortunately, Sir George Campbell's death cut short his "Memoirs" at the conclusion of his account of the Bengal famine, and he never completed his record of the work of his administration.

In our first notice of Sir George Campbell's *Memoirs* we said that their chief value lay in his remarks on questions of Indian policy. There is not a subject of importance which he has not treated, but we have only space to quote his words on the drink and opium questions. "The Government of India," he says, "called on the local governments for a report "on the alleged increase of drunkenness. We re- "ported that in Bengal drunkenness was not increas- "ing, except among the higher classes, and that the "growth of the habit among them was due to social "causes quite independent of the revenue adminis- "tration, *e.g.*, education, freedom from the trammels "of religion, the importation of liquors tempting to "the palate, and European example. The sale of "opium in India is managed on the same principle "as that of other drugs; but I am satisfied that "there it is not so great a danger as alcohol. I "caused very careful enquiry to be made in the "opium-growing districts where it would be entirely "impossible to prevent the illicit use of opium if the "people desired it, and the result was a complete "assurance that opium-eating was in no degree a "prevalent vice there. An examination of the "statistics convinced me that the tendency to opium "is very much a matter of race. In all the eastern "districts there is a large infusion of Indo-Chinese "blood, opium is very largely consumed; but with "a few exceptions, not elsewhere. When opium- "growing was free in the Punjab many of the "Sikhs used it to excess, but the reason for that was "that their religion prohibits tobacco. My theory "is that the temperament of the Aryan races inclines "them to alcohol, that of the Turanian races to "opium." (Vol. ii. pp. 272, 273.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF ARTICLES IN MONTHLY AND QUARTERLY MAGAZINES ON INDIAN SUBJECTS.

(*Extracted from the* "Review of Reviews,")
with additions.

SEPTEMBER, 1893.

Arena (Brentano). Stewart, Senator W. M., "Monometallism." (August.)

Contemporary Review (Isbister). Nicholson, Professor J. Shield, "The Indian Currency Experiment."

Fortnightly Review (Chapman and Hall). Grenfell, W. H., "Mr. Gladstone and the Currency."

Forum (Edward Arnold). White, H., "India's Action and the Sherman Law."

Indian Magazine and Review (A. Constable and Co., 14, Parliament Street, S.W.) D. F. C., "The Indian Chiefs and Rajahs lately in England;" Dowden, Col. T. F., "The Indian Currency;" Moulvi Mohammed Barakat Ullah, "The Muharram Festival."

National Review (W. H. Allen). Hubbard, Hon. Evelyn, "The Rupee Difficulty."

New Review (Longmans, Green, and Co.) Wedderburn, Sir William, Bart., M.P., "The Bombay Riots: Who is to Blame?"

Pall Mall Magazine (18, Charing Cross Road). Grenfell, W. H., "Bimetallism: The Case for Silver;" Astor, W. W., "The Case for Gold."

Theosophist (7, Duke Street, Adelphi). Old, W. R., "The Productive Art in India."

United Service Magazine (15, York Street, Covent Garden). Grant Duff, Sir Mountstuart E., "Rulers of India."

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF BOOKS ON INDIAN SUBJECTS.

(*Extracted from the* "Publishers' Circular.")
with additions.

SEPTEMBER, 1893.

Keene, H. G., C.I.E., Hon. M.A., Oxon......... "History of India, from the earliest times to the present day." 2 vols. (W. H. Allen and Co., Waterloo Place, S.W.).......... 16s. 0d.

Webb, William Wilfred, M.B.............."The Currencies of the Hindu States of Rajputana." (Archibald Constable and Co.).. ——

Printed by A. Bonner, 34 Bouverie Street, Fleet Street, E.C., and Published for the Proprietors (the Indian National Congress), at 84 and 85 Palace Chambers, London, S.W.